PARODY IN STOPPARD'S *ROSENCRANTZ AND GUILDENSTERN ARE DEAD, THE REAL INSPECTOR HOUND, AND DOGG'S HAMLET, CAHOOT'S MACBETH*

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
OF
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

BY

MOHAMMAD REZA SADRIAN

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
IN
THE DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LITERATURE

MARCH 2009

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

Prof. Dr. Sencer Ayata
Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Prof. Dr. Wolf König
Head of Department

This is to certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Prof. Dr. Nursel İçöz
Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Prof. Dr. Meral Çileli (METU, FLE) ———————

Prof. Dr. Nursel İçöz (METU, FLE) ———————

Prof. Dr. Ayşegül Yüksel (Ankara University, DTCF) ———————

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ünal Norman (METU, FLE) ———————

Dr. Pürnur Uçar (Başkent University, ALIT) ———————

I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.

Name, Last name: Mohammad Reza Sadrian

Signature :

ABSTRACT

PARODY IN STOPPARD'S
ROSENCRANTZ AND GUILDENSTERN ARE DEAD,
THE REAL INSPECTOR HOUND,
AND
DOGG'S HAMLET, CAHOOT'S MACBETH

Sadrian, Mohammad Reza

Ph.D., Department of English Literature

Supervisor: Prof. Dr. Nursel İçöz

March 2009, 283 Pages

This study scrutinizes parody in Stoppard's *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern Are Dead*, *The Real Inspector Hound,* and *Dogg's Hamlet, Cahoot's Macbeth*. After a historical survey of the definitions of parody with a stress on its definitions in our era, this study puts forward its definition of parody which is mainly based on Bakhtin's dialogic criticism. Parody then can be defined as a deliberate imitation or transformation of a socio-cultural product that takes a stance towards its original subject of imitation. Based on the original subject of parody, three kinds of parody are distinguished: genre, specific, and discourse. Following determining the kinds of parody that each of the aforementioned plays exhibits, this study expounds how Stoppard applies parody of the characters, plots, and themes in relation to their original subjects of parody. Later, a close critical study of these parodies will be conducted to elaborate on their functions and significances in each of the plays, their relations with and efficacy in the thematic context of the plays, the techniques used to achieve

them, and how far they are applied in line with or opposite to the post-modern's ideas.

Keywords: Parody. Specific parody. Genre parody. Discourse parody. Stoppard.

ÖZ

STOPPARD'IN
ROSENCRANTZ AND GUILDENSTERN ARE DEAD,
THE REAL INSPECTOR HOUND,
VE
DOGG'S HAMLET, CAHOOT'S MACBETH İNDE
PARODİ

Sadrian, Mohammad Reza
Doktora., İngiliz Edebiyatı Bölümü
Danışman: Prof. Dr. Nursel İçöz

Mart 2009, 283 sayfa

Bu çalışma Stoppard'ın *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern Are Dead*, *The Real Inspector Hound* ve *Dogg's Hamlet, Cahoot's Macbeth* adlı eserlerindeki parodiyi incelemektedir. Parodinin tanımlarının, günümüzdekilerini de vurgulayarak, tarihsel incelemesinin ardından, çalışma, Bakhtin'in 'dialogic' eleştirisine dayanan, kendi parodi tanımını ortaya koymaktadır. Sonuçta paradi, sosyo-kültürel bir yapıtın taklidi veya şeklinin değişmesidir. Ve bu yapıt taklit ettiği yapıta karşı bir tutum belirler. Parodinin özgün konusuna bakıldığında üç çeşit parodinin sivrildiği görülür: tür, özel ve söylem. Adı geçen oyunlarda hangi tip parodinin kullanıldığını açıkladıktan sonra, bu çalışma Stoppard'ın karakterlerın, öykülerin ve temaların parodisini, parodisi yapılan özgün konulara nasıl uygulandığı açıklanmaktadır. Bu çalışma, sözü geçen oyunlardaki parodi türlerini belirledikten sonra, bu eserler ve onların parodi konuları arasındaki ilişkiyi yorumlamaktadır. Ardından, bu parodiler, oyunlardaki fonksiyonlarını ve önemlerini anlamak, onların tematik yapısıyla

ilişkilerini ve bu yapı üzerindeki etkilerini görmek ve bunların oyunlarda post-modern fikirlerle ne derece parallel veya karşıt uygulandığını görmek için derinlemesine incelenecektir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Parodi. Tür Parodi. Özel Parodi. Söylem Parodi. Stoppard.

To My Parents

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my supervisor, Prof. Dr. Nursel İçöz for all her guidance, advice, criticism, and encouragement throughout the development of this study and over the course of my graduate career. Her enduring interest and positive attitude as well as her constant readiness and willingness to share valuable comments and suggestions have greatly contributed to the making of this thesis. Her insights are evident on every page of this study.

I would also like to heartily thank both Prof. Dr. Meral Çileli, whose comments and observations have been of great help throughout all the stages of my graduate study and writing the present thesis, and Prof. Dr. Ayşegül Yüksel, whose illuminating assessments, questions, and suggestions have been vital for improving this project.

I am also obliged to Assist. Prof. Dr. Margaret J-M Sönmez, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ünal Norman, and Prof. Dr. Ayten C. Bear who have always cared about my pursuits and have always been willing to guide me and share their knowledge and experience all along my graduate study.

My friends have all been helpful and considerate throughout. I thank them not only for being good listeners and supporters but also for tolerating my long absences throughout the writing of this thesis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The aim of this study is to elaborate on different kinds of parody and their functions in Stoppard's *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern Are Dead*, *The Real Inspector Hound*, and *Dogg's Hamlet, Cahoot's Macbeth.* Tom Stoppard, like many postmodern writers, makes use of parody extensively. In Stoppard's cited plays, different layers of parody in the postmodern sense are employed. Different layers of parody are closely related to different kinds of parody. Kinds of parody are, in turn, based on how parody is defined. Parody as a literary form is highly ambiguous. Its ambiguity is mainly because of different definitions that are put forward by various theorists and writers on the one hand and the variety of its practices by miscellaneous writers on the other. This study starts with putting forth an applicable modern definition of parody and specifying different kinds of it and then sets out to express Stoppard's special attitude toward employing parody in his plays

Although some critics have tried to look at the usage of parody in Stoppard's *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern Are Dead*, *The Real Inspector Hound*, and *Dogg's Hamlet, Cahoot's Macbeth*, there are not extensive deep and in-detail studies of them from the perspective of parody. Most of the critics who have written about the mentioned plays of Stoppard focus on a source study of them. Some of these critics, like C.W.E. Bigsby, D.J. Vickery, and Jim Hunter point out the influences on Stoppard's plays. A few other critics who criticize Stoppard's plays under the light of their application of parody, like Richard Allan Cave, are content with a limited analysis. Moreover there is not a common agreement on what to call Stoppard's usage of imitation. For instance, the imitation of Shakespeare's *Hamlet* in Stoppard's *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern Are Dead* is named parody by Katherine E. Kelly while Richard

Allan Cave in his article "An Art of Literary Travesty: *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern Are Dead, Jumpers"* which appeared in Anthony Jenkins' *Critical Essays on Tom Stoppard* calls it travesty. Some critics have particularly been more conservative and simply have called it 'remaking' or 'intertextuality'. At any rate, the scarcity, if not the lack of, an extensive in-detail study of Stoppard's *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern Are Dead*, *The Real Inspector Hound*, and *Dogg's Hamlet, Cahoot's Macbeth* from the view point of parody is one of the reasons for the present study to be carried out and it is what the succeeding chapters will be dealing with.

What seems to be another problematic issue among most of the modern literary theorists and critics is the definition of parody itself. The diversity of the proposed definitions of parody, especially in the twentieth century, can disclose the incapability of each one of these definitions to meet a general agreement about its comprehensiveness and accuracy. It seems that the best way to cope with this problem is to define parody by basing it on the orientation of each study. Accepting a range of definitions would be wiser than trying to stick to a single definition of parody which cannot include all its practices.

Stoppard's *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern Are Dead*, *The Real Inspector Hound*, and *Dogg's Hamlet, Cahoot's Macbeth* are selected to be studied under the light of parody because all of these plays exhibit the usage of parody in a variety of ways. As the title of *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern Are Dead* suggests, this play feeds on Shakespeare's *Hamlet*. It also parodies the style of Beckett's *Waiting for Godot* and *Endgame*. *Dogg's Hamlet, Cahoot's Macbeth* makes parodic use of Shakespeare's *Hamlet* and *Macbeth*. Both *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern Are Dead* and *Dogg's Hamlet, Cahoot's Macbeth* parody Shakespeare's works -a specific author's works. *The Real Inspector Hound,* on the other hand, parodies the genre of detective stories. Then studying these plays can indicate a variety of applications of parody in Stoppard's canon.

In *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern Are Dead*, Stoppard parodies Shakespeare's *Hamlet* from which he has borrowed the characters, their backgrounds, some parts of the plot, and some direct quotations sometimes

used to mean something different from their original meanings. At the same time, *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern Are Dead* can be taken as a parody of Beckett's *Waiting for Godot* from which Stoppard has borrowed the tone of some scenes, the philosophical thrust, the couples, some parts of the theme, some comic routines, etc. In addition to these 'specific parodies', this play exhibits different 'discourse parodies'; for instance, parody of the Elizabethan theatre and actors in the speeches and actions of the Player and his troupe.

The Real Inspector Hound parodies the genre of detective stories and whodunit –a 'genre parody'. Stoppard uses mystery in nearly all his plays. This element of mystery is generally treated comically. *The Real Inspector Hound*, which is a kind of detective play, not only uses mystery comically but also parodies the genre of detective story –which presents a mystery about a crime and tries to uncover it. Moreover, it conducts a somewhat systematic 'discourse parody' of the language of drama critics/reviewers and military people.

In *Dogg's Hamlet, Cahoot's Macbeth*, Stoppard illustrates 'discourse parodies'. The play parodies school plays on the one hand, and language or English language on the other. To be more precise, in the first part of the play, *Dogg's Hamlet*, the school stages that present Shakespearean plays are regarded as the subjects of the play's most obvious parody. English language is also another subject of parody in the play.

To approach the stated goal of this study, the first and foremost step is to lay out a range of applicable definitions of 'parody' with regard to the modern literary approaches such as Gerard Genette's structuralist approach, Mikhail M. Bakhtin's dialogic criticism, Roland Barthes's poststructuralist views, and Jacques Derrida's deconstructionalist concepts. It would be illuminating to have a short glance at the history of the definitions of parody before viewing it under the light of the cited modern critical approaches. This study, then, undertakes to scrutinize the application of different layers of parody in each of the aforementioned plays of Stoppard. This means that the original subject of the parody in each instance of its usage will be uncovered and the attitude of each parody towards its subject will be expounded. After this, a close

critical study of these parodies will be conducted to elaborate on their functions and significances in each of the plays, their relations with and efficacy in the thematic context of the plays, the techniques used to achieve them, and how far they are applied in line with or opposite the postmodern ideas.

1.1 Recent Definitions of Parody

There is such an abundance of literary theories in the twentieth century that no other century can be compared to it. The definitions of parody that are put forward in the twentieth century are likewise far more than the definitions put forward in the previous centuries. At the same time, some of the new concepts and literary theories that have emerged in the twentieth century can shed more light on the elusive parts of the definition of parody. The twentieth century's literary theories under which parody will be examined in this study are Mikhail M. Bakhtin's dialogic criticism, Gerard Genette's structuralist approach, Roland Barthes's poststructuralist concepts, and Jacques Derrida's deconstructionalism.

During the first decades of the twentieth century Bakhtin's ideas were introduced in Russia, although they reached Europe about half a century later. Bakhtin's contribution to the definition of parody could be generally divided into two categories. The first one is his direct elaboration on the definition of parody and the second is his dialogic concepts under which parody can be studied.

Bakhtin's main ideas about the definition of parody can be enumerated as parody's being a field for the clash of voices – parody's polyphonic nature – its being double-voiced, its carnivalesque role, and its having different kinds. Bakhtin believes that the response of parody to its original subject mainly includes a kind of laughter. The laughing attitude of parody towards its original subject is considered to be the symptom of the hostility of parody towards its

original subject (Bakhtin 1990: 52). Parody, then, exhibits a battleground where the original subject of parody is challenged by the parody. To challenge the original subject, parody must necessarily represent it. This means that there must be at least two voices present in parody. One is the voice of parody and the other is the voice of the original subject. These are the reasons that make Bakhtin consider parody as double-voiced (Bakhtin 1984: 185). At the same time, the mere existence of two voices in parody is enough for Bakhtin to call it polyphonic. Polyphony, as a characteristic feature of some of the literary works, is the existence of more than one voice in a literary work. The presence of a second voice –or more – in a literary work undermines the power and the force of the first dominant voice. Some literary works, however, represent the second voice as opposing the first one.

The polyphonic nature of parody and the clash of voices in it are what give parody a carnivalesque role. Carnivalesque, Bakhtin argues, is a feature in some literary works which exists when the dominant voice –or the authorial/sacred voice – is challenged especially by being ridiculed. Bakhtin takes his carnivalesque concept from the carnival ceremonies in some pre-modern societies. During the carnival period, people were allowed a degree of freedom. This freedom lets people mock and debase the sacred untouchable subjects (Bakhtin 1990: 58). Likewise, in some literary works, including parody works, the authorial dominant voice is ridiculed. The very ridiculing of the dominant voice establishes the grounds for the destruction of the dominant voice. By undermining its original subject, parody paves the way for the creation of a new subject – a new dominant voice, which is the voice of parody.

Furthermore, Bakhtin classifies parody into some different kinds indirectly. Considering the original subject of parody, he accepts a range of these subjects. The original subject of parody for Bakhtin can be another person's style or typical manner of seeing, thinking, or speaking. It can be the verbal forms of another person's work or it can be the deepest principles governing another's discourse (Bakhtin 1984: 194). The significant point that is implied in this classification of the original subject of parody is that it

endeavours to broaden the previously-drawn restricted circle of the original subject of parody to any discourse form; that is, it is not necessarily confined to the written verbal forms of language. It is so because Bakhtin accepts the typical manner of seeing or thinking as a kind of the original subject of parody.

From another point of view, Bakhtin's dialogic concepts can help in clarifying the definition of parody, too. Bakhtin's dialogic criticism stresses the dialogic nature of the literary works. In other words, every single work is considered to be a single chain in the whole chain of literary works of past, present, and future. A literary work is also looked at as an utterance which presupposes its being a response to another work and necessitates being responded to by its addressee. This means that a literary work is itself a response to a previous one and at the same time it possesses an author and an addressee within it. Parody works, like the other literary works, are responses to previous works and they necessitate addressees. This means that the recognition of the original subject of parody by its addressee is a mandatory factor in considering a work to be parody; otherwise, they will be like the other literary works which are responses to their previously written works and the recognition of this relationship is not a significant matter for their audiences.

The structuralistic view point of Gerard Genette about parody is yet another touchstone in the history of the definitions of parody in the twentieth century. Genette calls the relationship between a text and an earlier one hypertextuality; of course, if this relationship is not in the manner of commentary (Genette 5). He considers transformation and imitation as two methods used in different kinds of hypertextualities. Parody, based on Genette's point of view, uses only transformation in relation to its original subject; transformation is considered to exist only for individual texts, not for genres and styles. The mood of parody towards its original subject is the other point that Genette emphasizes. Parody illustrates a playful mood in relation to its original subject. The playful mood, however, can merge into the satirical one. Nevertheless, if the mood of transformation of an earlier text is dominantly satirical, Genette prefers to dismiss it from the circle of parody (Genette 28).

Genette's hard and fast definition of parody has at least the advantage of broadening the scope of parody from the view point of its mood in relation to its original subject. If the mood of parody towards its original subject is to be considered playful, it can embrace both of the etymological meanings of parody; that is, it can be a text mocking another one and it can be a text beside another one.

Nevertheless, Genette's definition of parody has the disadvantage of confining the scope of parody to short passages and texts. If parody's relation to its original subject is only that of transformation of individual texts and if parody cannot imitate styles and genres, parody will be limited to the texts that directly transform their original subject's texts; this is actually the parody of titles and very short texts. Genette's definition of parody, thus, cannot include texts whose original subjects are longer than short texts or titles.

Furthermore, Roland Barthes's poststructural notions about texts and authors yield some different perspectives from which parody can be scrutinized. Barthes considers texts as signs – the signs that do not and cannot rest on single definite signifieds. Texts, then, furnish several signifieds; that is, they are plural. The very plurality of texts is the reason why texts cannot be categorized under a single genre (Barthes 1989: 1005-1010). Parody texts and their original subjects, from this point of view, cannot be categorized under a single genre. In other words, it will be impossible to have genres as the original subject of parody. Barthes, thus, cannot accept a definition of parody which in any way includes genre as the original subject of parody.

Barthes's idea about author is the other illuminating concept that can shed more light on the definition of parody. Barthes rejects the humanistic understanding of author; that is, he does not accept the concept of author whose purpose, intention, or control affects the form or the meaning of a text. For Barthes, authors mix writings and counter ones with others and the results are texts that never rest on single signifieds. Author is simply a space wherein texts –languages- circulate. He chooses the name scriptor for the previously called author; a scriptor who is devoid of originality, purpose, and intention in

creating texts (Barthes 1988: 167-172). Regarding the definition of parody from Barthes's view point about author will result in rejecting a particular author's manner, matter, or style as being the original subject of parody. At the same time, the authorial intention in creating parody loses its previously held stance.

The deconstructionalist view point of Jacques Derrida about author, reader, and text can be the other outlook for studying parody. Derrida believes that in a signifying system the signified of a sign is never fully present. The signified of a signifier exists because of the difference between that signified and the other signifieds in that signifying system and this existence which is based on difference is thus deferred – it is never fully present. Texts, like signs, have their signifieds in the continuous process of signification; that is, their signifieds are not present (Derrida 1988: 108-123). The intended meaning of author, thus, loses its validity. The definition of parody based on this outlook should be devoid of author and authorial intention because author's intention, whatever it is, will not be present in his/her produced text; after all, the signified is never fully present.

What could be the role of reader in relation to text's meaning if text has not its meaning present in it? Derrida contends that reader's role is not the traditional one; that is, reader is not supposed to reach at a definite meaning, as text does not have one. Reader is supposed to arrive at the deferential nature of the signified of text; to show how the meaning is postponed and how the meanings of text could be against each other and even against what the author seems to intend. Parody's reader, like the other texts' readers, is to come to this indeterminacy of the meaning of the parody text.

Based on Derrida's view points, then, the definition of parody cannot embrace author and authorial intention nor can it include the traditional place of its reader. At the same time, parody texts, like other texts, provide grounds for their own dissemination and deconstruction. If this idea of Derrida is extended more, it can provide some extreme results. One of these results can be that no label, genre, or classification could be meaningful since texts provide no definite meaning and even they exhibit meanings opposite to what they seem to

mean. Could it be possible, thus, to have a definition of parody based on Derrida's deconstructionalist approach?!

1.2 Parody: Poststructuralism and Postmodernism

Postmodernism in literature and arts has parallels with poststructuralism in linguistics and literary theories. Some of these parallels which are related to parody can be the concepts of genre, text, and subject. As an umbrella term referring to the literature and art after World War II (1939-1945), postmodernism blends literary genres, cultural and stylistic levels, and the serious and the playful in such a way that the produced texts resist traditional classifications. Postmodernism, then, questions the concept of genre itself by blurring the boundaries between different genres. The traditional distinction between various genres is also rejected by poststructuralism. Poststructuralism does not see a text as an autonomous entity with well-drawn boundaries. It views a text as a tissue of quotations without quotation marks. Then, if texts are considered to be constructed out of various other texts, there cannot be a text which exhibits a single genre because there are various genres that are at work in it; thus, the concept of genre as it is traditionally perceived is undermined. The intertextuality that poststructuralists emphasize is what postmodern artists depict by their abundant use of parody and pastiche. After all, parody and pastiche are the devices that vividly exhibit the relationship between a text and the other texts. Besides, the use of these forms is itself an impediment in specifying a single genre to the text that makes use of them.

As considered by the poststructuralists, a text is an open field of signification whose closure or centring on a stable signifier is totally denied. This is not only the characteristic of texts but also the basic feature of language, which is a signifying system. If there is not a determinacy in the meaning of texts and language, there is not a centre that one can rely on as the source of

meaning. Any source that claims a definite or ultimate meaning is rejected by poststructuralism. Postmodernism, like poststructuralism, rejects the centre of meaning. This denunciation can be seen in the strong rejection of the grand narratives because of their totalizing premises and effects – the grand narratives are considered to be any claim for the ultimate, central meaning.

Moreover, postmodernism shares with poststructuralism its concept of the self -or subject. Postmodernism observes that the subject is not an entity separate from the society, history, or culture. The subject is considered as a socio-cultural construct, hence a language product. More or less, a similar notion about the subject is stressed by the poststructuralists. They divest the subject of a separate coherent identity. Poststructuralism looks at the subject as a purely linguistic product, a space wherein the differential elements of language play without centring on a definite final signified. Thus, the reconceptualization of the subject as a linguistic or cultural product is the other similarity between postmodernism and poststructuralism.

Regarding parody from the viewpoint of both postmodernism and poststructuralism, therefore, leads to a new perspective towards the definition of parody. Since both movements contravene the existence of sharp borderlines between various texts, they will not be hospitable to a definition of parody which embraces genres. Moreover, both postmodernism and poststructuralism believe that there cannot be one and only one meaning for a text. The text, after all, is a tissue of quotations without the inverted commas. This rather insinuates that neither of these movements can accept the notion that a text belongs to one individual author. Thus, these movements cannot welcome a definition of parody which accommodates the acceptance of ‘an individual author’s text’, or ‘an author’s style’. The subject, traditional author, is believed by both postmodernism and poststructuralism to be a construct whose product, the text, is not purely based on his/her intention. Both of these movements, then, impugn a definition of parody that is based on the authorial intention.

1.3 Parody: The Meaning and Definition in This Study

Parody has been used from the time of the antique Greek plays to the present time. The long history of the definitions and applications of parody results in a wide variety of ways for defining it; a variety which gets even wider when parody is studied under the light of the concepts of poststructuralism and postmodernism. Regarding the old definitions of parody and considering the major tenets of poststructuralism and postmodernism, this study proposes its definition of parody; a definition that is mainly applicable for scrutinizing Stoppard's *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern Are Dead*, *The Real Inspector Hound*, and *Dogg's Hamlet, Cahoot's Macbeth*.

In this study the definition of the term 'parody' will be mainly based on an extended Bakhtinian view. It is worth mentioning that this definition does not claim to be a comprehensive one which can embrace all kinds of its practice during the long course of the history of parody. It is rather a definition that fits a close study of Stoppard's mentioned plays. Parody, then, can be defined as a deliberate imitation or transformation of a socio-cultural product that takes a stance towards its original subject of imitation. This stance, which is fluid, includes at least a playful one. In other words, the attitude of parody towards its subject can be evaluative or non-evaluative, ironical or satirical, derisive or admiring, etc. but it must embrace at least a playful one. By using the cultural product this definition tries to escape the limited boundaries that some literary theorists have drawn for the original subject of parody. In other words, if the original subject of parody is taken to be a socio-cultural product, it will not be restricted to the literature world. The parody work can take the manner of a writer, a text, a genre, or a human activity as its original subject of imitation.

Closely related to the definition of parody are the different kinds that it may assume. Simon Dentith at the end of his *Parody* divides parody into two categories: specific and general. He observes that the specific one

> consists of a parody of a specific art-work or piece of writing… [And] general parody, by contrast, takes as its **hypotext** [, the original subject of parody,] not one specific work but a whole manner, style or discourse. (193-194)

To expand this division with regard to Genette's structuralist views, Barthes's poststructuralist notions, Derrida's deconstructionalist approach, and Bakhtin's dialogic criticism, this study presumes three divisions for parody: specific parody, genre parody, and discourse parody. A specific parody, as this study suggests, is the parody of a particular text, or a specific writer's manner, tone, style, diction, attitude, or idea. A genre parody is to mean the parody of the characteristic features of a genre. Here genre means any type of genre associated with writing whether literary or non-literary; nonetheless, the primary concern of the genre parody is the literary genres. A discourse parody is regarded as the parody of the characteristic features of any type of human activity. This wide group embraces any type of parody of discourse – in its broadest meaning- beyond the realm of texts and also beyond the genres specified to them.

These different kinds of parody can assume a variety of functions, although some critics have tried to restrict the functions of parody to one or a few numbers, the postmodern usage of it exhibits a range of these functions. After all, some parodies function as a destructive tool to attack their original subjects while some other parodies take an appreciative stance towards their original subject; some of the parodies exhibit the distrust of their writers in relation to the parody's original subject whereas some parodies show critical evaluation of their original subjects; some parodies are used with a satirical intention despite the fact that some parodies take no evaluative stance towards their original subject. To accept a range of these functions, thus, seems to be more functional in regard to parody's actual practices.

1.4 Methodology and Limitations of the Study

In accordance with its aim of analyzing the application of parody in Stoppard's *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern Are Dead*, *The Real Inspector Hound*, and *Dogg's Hamlet, Cahoot's Macbeth*, this study will have a detailed chronological survey of the definitions of parody introduced by different theorists and critics. After this, a qualitative study of the parodies used in these plays will be conducted. The major stress of the introductory and the second chapter is on the definitions proposed in the twentieth century rather than the theories put forward during the earlier periods. After all, it is in the twentieth century that there is an abundance of theories of literature. Examining the definition of parody from different perspectives is what the introductory chapter of this study has already glanced over and the next chapter will be dealing with in detail. Having examined the various definitions of parody, the second chapter, thus, proposes this study's definition of parody which is primarily based on Genette's structuralist views and Bakhtin's dialogic criticism on the one hand and practice of parody in the aforementioned plays of Stoppard on the other.

The next three chapters of this research are devoted to a qualitative study of the usage of parody in Stoppard's *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern Are Dead*, *The Real Inspector Hound*, and *Dogg's Hamlet, Cahoot's Macbeth*. Analyzing the application of the definition of parody to *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern Are Dead* will be what the third chapter of this study is to undertake. The first part of this chapter will determine different kinds of parodies that this play illustrates. This play, after all, enjoys a multi-layer parody rather than just a single parody of Shakespeare's *Hamlet*. The second section of this chapter will explain the functions of these parodies in the whole play on the one hand, and their relations with the thematic context and the structure of the play on the other. The last part of this chapter will demonstrate

Stoppard's techniques in creating these parodies. This section will also function as an evaluative study on Stoppard's application of parodies.

The fourth chapter will elaborate on the application of parody in *The Real Inspector Hound*. Chapter five will also exhibit a similar concern but this time in *Dogg's Hamlet, Cahoot's Macbeth.* More or less, these two chapters will have the same divisions and concerns that the third chapter will display. The concluding chapter will briefly sum up what the main body of the study sets out. Moreover, it functions as a kind of comparative study of the usage of parody in all the three plays. This chapter will also look at the parodies used in the mentioned plays in the larger context of postmodernism in which parody plays a major role.

The limitations of this study can be traced in both the beginning part of it, which sets out the definition and function of parody, and the main part of it, which will analyze parody in the aforementioned plays of Tom Stoppard. The beginning part of this study has briefly reviewed the proposed definitions of parody with a stress on its definition in our era. This means that a full historical account of the definitions of parody is beyond the scope of the present study. Also, the practice of parody in different literary genres –like the novel, drama, poetry, etc. – and in the course of its long history, although closely related to the definition of it, is excluded from the present study. The main part of this study is devoted to finding and analyzing parody in Stoppard's *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern Are Dead*, *The Real Inspector Hound*, and *Dogg's Hamlet, Cahoot's Macbeth*. In other words, this study neither will focus on using parody in the other works of Stoppard nor will it show concern for other elements in these plays that are not related to parody, such as their genesis or their production history.

1.5 Aim of the Study

The aim of this study is to elaborate on different kinds of parody and their functions in Stoppard's *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern Are Dead*, *The Real Inspector Hound*, and *Dogg's Hamlet, Cahoot's Macbeth.* Tom Stoppard, like many postmodern writers, makes use of parody extensively. In Stoppard's cited plays, different layers of parody in the postmodern sense are employed. Different layers of parody are closely related to different kinds of parody. Kinds of parody are, in turn, based on how parody is defined. Parody as a literary form is highly ambiguous. Its ambiguity is mainly because of different definitions that are put forward by various theorists and writers on the one hand and the variety of its practices by miscellaneous writers on the other. This study starts with putting forth an applicable modern definition of parody and specifying different kinds of it. This definition is mainly applicable for scrutinizing Stoppard's *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern Are Dead*, *The Real Inspector Hound*, and *Dogg's Hamlet, Cahoot's Macbeth*. It will be mainly based on an extended Bakhtinian view although it makes use of Genette's structuralist view, Barthes's poststructuralist outlook, and Derrida's deconstructionalist approach too. The present study then sets out to distinguish the various kinds of parodies Stoppard applies in his aforementioned plays. Along with this, the function(s) of each of the parodies in the whole thematic context of each of the aforementioned plays will be analysed in order to display Stoppard's major strategy in constructing them as parodic.

CHAPTER 2

PARODY: PAST AND PRESENT

The long history of the definitions of parody shows how this literary device was originally used by the ancient Greek writers and how it entered English literature. The diversity of the definitions of parody in pre-twentieth century English literature can be the sign of the elusiveness of the term. During the twentieth century, with the advent of a host of new literary theories, the problem of defining parody seems to have become harder to solve; nonetheless, the illuminating concepts of M. M. Bakhtin, G. Genette, R. Barthes, and J. Derrida shed light on some of the problematic aspects of the definition of parody. After reviewing the pre-twentieth century's definitions of parody, this chapter studies parody under the light of the literary theories of Bakhtin. Genette, Barthes, and Derrida respectively in order to propose a definition of parody which can be applied for scrutinizing Tom Stoppard's *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern Are Dead*, *The Real Inspector Hound*, and *Dogg's Hamlet, Cahoot's Macbeth*.

2.1 Parody: A Pre-twentieth Century Account

The word 'parody', as Oxford English Dictionary writes, is derived from the word 'parodia' which in its ancient Greek meaning is comprised of the prefix 'para' –meaning beside, in subsidiary relation, or mock - and the noun 'aidein' –meaning either "a song sung alongside another" or "a mock-song / mock-poem". The duality in etymological meanings of parody is one of the basic difficulties of defining it. 'Does parody mean a song or a poem that

intends to mock another one?' Or 'does it mean a song or poem beside or in subsidiary relation to another one?' The history of literature, from the ancient Greek time to the early English literature and from there to the pre-twentieth century's English literature, provides different responses to these questions and thereupon different definitions of parody.

Aristotle (384-322 BC) is credited to be the earliest writer who used the word 'parody'. In his *Poetics,* Aristotle uses parody to refer to the works of the earlier writer Hegemon the Thasian who lived in the fifth century BC. Margaret A. Rose in her *Parody: ancient, modern, and post-modern* asserts that Householder[1] deduces the definition of parody from Aristotle's application of the term to works written by Hegemon. She quotes the definition of parody as Householder suggests: "it is a narrative poem of moderate length, in epic meter, using epic vocabulary, and treating a light, satirical, or mock-heroic subject" (7). When Aristotle insinuates that the epic meter and the epic vocabulary are used in parody in order to treat a light, satirical, or mock-heroic subject, he actually underlies the mocking attitude of parody towards its original subject. After all, the incongruity that results from treating a light subject in epic's dignified meter and solemn vocabulary produces laughter in relation to that subject.

On the other hand, Simon Dentith asserts in his *Parody* that Householder's definition of parody is what the ancient Greeks generally conceived of when they referred to parody (10). Dentith also notices that during the ancient Greek time 'parodia' was a specific literary form for which prizes were awarded at poetic contests (10). One of the earliest extant examples of these parodies is a parody of Homer by the name of *Batrachomyomachia*[2] which means 'War between the Mice and the Frog'.

---

[1] Rose Refers to Fred W. Householder's article*,* 'ΠΑΡΩΙΔΙΑ'*,* in *Journal of Classical Philology*, 39/1, January 1944, pp. 1-9.

[2] It is one of the earliest extant parodies of Homer. In his translation of Bakhtin's *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*, Holquist in an explanatory footnote to 'From the Prehistory of Novelistic Discourse', asserts that *Batrachomyomachia* is now usually ascribed to Pigers of

Euripides' *Cyclops*, a satyr play of fifth century BC, is another survived parody from the ancient Greek culture. It "provides a structural parody of the Cyclops episode in the *Odyssey*" (Dentith 42). Most of the plays of Aristophanes (448-388 BC) are "full of parodic allusions, most notably to the plays of Euripides" (Dentith 43). *The Frogs* and *The Clouds* are two of his plays that can vividly exhibit his usage of parody. In *The Frogs* Aristophanes directs his parody towards Euripides; this parody is in the form of literary criticism (Dane 49). In *The Clouds* Aristophanes parodies "the stage conventions, in particular the dues ex machina", as well as Euripides' Hecuba (Dane 61-62). *The Clouds* also exhibits parodies of Socrates and the Sophists (Dentith 44). Seneca (4 BC- 65 AD) and Petronius (?- 66 AD) are two Roman writers who employed parody in their works. Seneca's *Apocolocyntosis* shows "a parody of the council of the Gods, and another of the judgment in Hell" (Dentith 48). Petronius's *Satyricon* "is a parody of the platonic Symposium" (Dentith 47). Parody plays a central role in the writings of the second century Hellenistic writer Lucian, too. Lucian's *The Judging of the Goddesses*, for instance, is a parodic prose version of the story of the judgment of Paris (Dentith 49). *The Consolation of Philosophy* which is written by Boethius during the sixth century AD is yet another example of parodic forms used by Roman writers (Dentith 49). *The Consolation of Philosophy* was so widely known during the medieval culture that it was translated into Anglo-Saxon by Alfred the Great and later into English by Geoffrey Chaucer.

Although the first usages of parody indicate the presence of the humorous elements, later usages of parody by Greek and Roman writers designate that the term referred "to a more widespread practice of quotations, not necessarily humorous, in which both writers and speakers introduce allusions to previous texts" (Dentith 10). Thus, in later usages of the word 'parody' in the ancient Greek and Roman world, parody came to embrace both

---

Halicarnassus, the brother-in-law of Mausoleus, whose tomb was one of the seven wonders of the ancient world.

of its root meanings: it could be a song sung in subsidiary relation to another song or it could be a song sung mocking another one.

In England, one of the earliest applications of parody can be seen in Chaucer's fourteenth-century *Canterbury Tales*. The parody in *Canterbury Tales* is most vivid when Chaucer, the character, is asked by the Host to tell a tale of mirth. Then Chaucer, the character, narrates his tale of Sir Thopas which is both a self-parody and a parody of the clichés of the dull, pompous, and prolix metrical romances then in vogue. Later, Chaucer, the character, is interrupted by the Host's plea to stop his rhymed doggerel.

Regarding the definition of parody, there are at least two points in Chaucer's tale of 'Sir Thopas'. One is the subject of his parody and the other is the presence of comic elements in it. The subject that Chaucer holds up to ridicule is a genre which was practiced by his contemporary and earlier writers (Rose 91). It seems that Chaucer did not have a particular writer in mind when trying to ridicule the clichés of the romances. The comic element in Chaucer's parody is the other point of the tale of 'Sir Thopas' (Rose 92). The comic effect is mostly created by his incongruous imitation of the romance genre. The incongruous imitation, in turn, is a kind of mocking. Margaret A. Rose in her *Parody: ancient, modern, and post-modern* explains Chaucer's parody in terms of its comic depiction of the status of its writer:

> Unlike the host the external reader, however, is put into the position of being able to recognize the irony inherent in … the author's depiction of himself in the role of artless storyteller, as well as the ironic suitability of such meta-fictional parody for the tale of the author. For if it can be said that each pilgrim's tale reflects his or her standing or profession in some manner, so it can be suggested that one of the most appropriate literary forms for the author would be the meta-fictional self-parody…Chaucer's parodical 'Tale of Sir Thopas' is …both metafictional and comic. (91)

The practice of parody by Chaucer points to the inclination of the early English concepts of parody to its ridiculing nature and the presence of comic elements in it.

One of the earliest definitions of parody in England is put forward by Ben Jonson (1572-1637) in his *Every Man in his Humor*. In the fifth Act of this play, Jonson defines parody: "A parody! A parody! With a kind of miraculous gift to make it absurder than it was". For Jonson, a parody is an imitation of verse that makes the original work more absurd. In his definition of parody Jonson uses the word 'absurd' as an equivalent of the word 'ridiculous'. Referring to Jonson's definition of parody, Margaret A. Rose accepts this meaning for Jonson's usage of the word 'absurd': "[Ben Jonson] clearly emphasized the more ridiculous aspects of the form" (10).

England's eighteenth century witnesses the usage of another terminology for the definition that nowadays almost all literary critics accept as parody. Joseph Addison in number 249 of *The Spectator*[1] writes:

> The two great Branches of Ridicule in Writing are Comedy and Burlesque. The first ridicules Persons by drawing them in their proper Characters, the other by drawing them quite unlike themselves. Burlesque is therefore of two kinds; the first represents mean Persons in the Accoutrements of Heroes, the other describes great Persons acting and speaking like the basest among the People. *Don Quixote* is an Instance of the first, and *Lucian's* Gods of the second.

Addison, then, describes burlesque in its two types as a way of ridiculing which is not what is found in comedy. Addison's application of the term 'burlesque' to a significant example of modern parody in the novel, Cervantes's *Don Quixote***,** and a type of ancient parody, Lucian's *Gods*, represents one of the significant points of the history of the replacement of the term parody by that of the burlesque (Rose 57-60). Furthermore, the definition and the application of the term 'burlesque' by Addison exhibits how the ridiculing element has been present in the definition that now is considered as parody.

In nineteenth century England, Isaac D'Israeli (1766-1848) provides another concept about parody, a concept that broadens the previously

[1] This essay was published in 15 December of 1711. In the beginning of this essay, Addison introduces his subject as "Laughter and Ridicule".

mentioned definitions. Linda Hutcheon in her *A Theory of Parody* quotes D'Israeli: "Parodists do not waste their talent on obscure productions when they offer their playful honours"[1] (57). D'Israeli broadens the scope of parody by accepting the playful element in it, rather than the ridiculous one. Moreover, he stresses the fact that works are parodied in proportion to their popularity. This aspect of D'Israeli's notion implies the importance that is given to the reader of parody because the author of a parody so chooses the original subject of his parody that the reader of his parody can recognize that original subject; otherwise, the aim of the parody will be at stake. Thus, the parodist mostly chooses popular subjects for his parody rather than obscure ones. Explaining the Victorian understanding of parody, Margaret A. Rose quotes from D'Israeli's 'Parodies'[2]:

> Parodies were frequently practiced by the ancients, and with them like ourselves, consisted of a work grafted on another work, but which turned on a different subject by a slight change of the expressions. It might be a sport of fancy, the innocent child of mirth; or a satirical arrow drawn from the quiver of caustic criticism; or it was that malignant art which only studies to make the original of the parody, however beautiful, contemptible and ridiculous. (28)

This view indicates that D'Israeli could distinguish between a variety of different ways in which parody could be applied. Based on these various applications of parody, D'Israeli accepts a range of definitions for parody; then, he suggests that parody is a changing of another work whose applications can range from comic fancy through playfulness "to the satiric [and] to the malignant reduction of an original to the ridiculous" (Rose 281). Compared to the previously cited definitions of parody which singled out one or some applications of parody, D'Israeli's definition, which indicates a range of such applications, seems more comprehensive and less problematic.

---

[1] Hutcheon refers to Isaac D'Israeli's essay "A Chapter on Parodies" as it appeared in Walter Hamilton's *Parodies of the Works of English and American Authors* (1884-9).

[2] Rose takes this quotation from D'Israeli's 'Parodies', in Isaac D'Israeli, *Curiosities of Literature*, Second Series (1823) 14th ed. (London, 1849), 3 vols.; vol. 2, p. 505.

The variety of the pre-twentieth century's definitions of parody, whose few examples have already been cited, indicates the lack of an all-accepting definition of parody. The Greek practices of parody perceived it mostly as the comic imitation and transformation of an epic verse work. In England, Chaucer applied parody to his *Canterbury Tales* and his application stressed the comic aspects of it. In eighteenth century England, parody, as a term, was mainly replaced by burlesque while still its comic aspect was emphasized. The nineteenth century in England provided deeper and broader definitions of parody, which suggests accepting a range of definitions and applications for it rather than sticking to a single definition or application. Nevertheless, with the rapid growth of the new critical and linguistic approaches during the twentieth century, there have emerged miscellaneous deeper and wider studies of parody, which render the previous ones shallow or mono-dimensional. Although some of the twentieth century critical approaches to literature do not touch parody directly, viewing parody from their perspectives would shed more light on understanding the different aspects of this literary form.

2.2 Parody: A Twentieth Century Perspective

In addition to introducing a wide range of critical approaches through which parody can be studied, the twentieth century witnesses a wide variety of outlooks towards parody. Bakhtin and his dialogic criticism is the first approach through which parody is to be looked at. Then, a review of Genette's structuralistic and Barthes's poststructural notions will be carried out in order for this study to scrutinize parody under the light of these concepts. At last, parody is studied regarding Derrida's deconstructionalistic ideas.

2.2.1 Mikhail Mikhailovich Bakhtin

More or less during the same decades that Russian formalists were highly active – namely 1920s and 1930s- dialogic criticism was forming in the Soviet Union by Mikhail M. Bakhtin. However, as M. H. Abrams in his *A Glossary of Literary Terms* points out, Bakhtin's works "remained virtually unknown to the West until 1980s, when translations of his writings gave him a wide and rapidly increasing influence" (62). Bakhtin's ideas still remain influential in the last decades of the twentieth century and the first decade of the twenty first century.

Bakhtin's direct reference to parody is when he talks about the role of parody in the evolution of the novel in his *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays* and his *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics.* Defining parody in his latter book, Bakhtin asserts that in parody "the author … speaks in someone else's discourse … [and] parody introduces in to that discourse a semantic intention that is directly opposed to the original one" (193). In other words, Bakhtin stresses the hostility and the clash of voices between parody and its original work. M. A. Rose misleadingly comments on this stress of Bakhtin. She asserts that Bakhtin's remark on parody fails to mention "the comic colouring of the parody" (Rose 127). The laughter or colouring that Rose believes Bakhtin failed to mention in his *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics* is actually explained in Bakhtin's essay 'From the Prehistory of Novelistic Discourse' as appears in his *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. In this essay, Bakhtin maintains that there are two decisive factors in the prehistory of the novelistic discourse. One of these factors is laughter and the other one, which is the aftermath of the first one, is polyglossia. The laughter, which Bakhtin indexes here, is "originally nothing more than ridiculing of another's language and another's direct discourse" (Bakhtin 1990: 50). Bakhtin assigns parody the role of ridiculing: "the nature and methods available for ridiculing something are highly varied, and not exhausted by parodying and travestying in a strict sense"

(Bakhtin 1990: 52). Bakhtin, thus, admits that ridicule is a component of parody, although he does not confine it to parody alone.

Furthermore, like some of the Formalists, Bakhtin believes that parody is a phenomenon which is two-ways directed. In his *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics,* Bakhtin talks about the characteristics of discourse in parody:

> Discourse in [Parody] … has a twofold direction. It is directed both toward the referential object of speech, as in ordinary discourse, and toward another's discourse, toward someone else's speech. If we do not recognise the existence of this second context of someone else's speech and begin to perceive … parody in the same way ordinary speech is perceived, that is, as speech directed only at its referential object, then we will not grasp [it]… in … [its] essence …. Parody [will be taken] simply for a poor work of art. (185)

Parody's being two-ways directed makes it different from ordinary discourse. Not only is parody directed toward the referential object of speech but also it is directed toward someone else's speech which possesses its own referential object. What seems more significant than considering parody as double-voiced is Bakhtin's stress on parody's recipient, that is, its reader. Here, the recognition of both of the referential objects of parody by its reader is considered as one of the necessary grounds on which parody is built. Then, parody's relation to its reader is another significant point that Bakhtin finds in parody.

Bakhtin points to different types of parody which may exist. His classification of the various types of parody is based on the subject matter of parody and the authorial intentions. In his *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*, Bakhtin refers to these various types:

> One can parody another person's style as a style; one can parody another's socially typical or individually characterological manner of seeing, thinking, and speaking. The depth of the parody may also vary. One can parody merely superficial verbal forms, but one can also parody the very deepest principles governing another's discourse. (194)

The significant point that Bakhtin clarifies in his classification of parody based on its subject is that the subject of parody may be even beyond the realm of texts. Bakhtin extends the subject of parody much further. He contends that the subject of parody is not necessarily restricted to the verbal forms of language, whether written or oral; it can be a socially typical or individually characterological manner of seeing, or thinking.

Bakhtin enumerates some other types of parody in his essay 'From the Prehistory of Novelistic Discourse', too. These kinds are referred to as genre parody, satyr play, macaronic parody, parodia sacra, and carnivalesque parody. One type of parody can be the parody of serious discourses. This kind of parody represents itself in the form of parody of genres and generic styles (Bakhtin 1990: 52). Speaking about the past literature with an emphasis on the literature of the Hellenistic period, Bakhtin states his conviction about the parody of genres:

> It is our conviction that there never was a single strictly straightforward genre, no single type of direct discourse – artistic, rhetorical, philosophical, religious, ordinary everyday – that did not have its own parodying and travestying double, its own comic-ironic contre-partie. (Bakhtin 1990: 53)

In other words, if there has been a genre, there must necessarily be a parody of it. Bakhtin believes that even some of the existing genres are actually the parodies of some other previously existing genres: "In other cases we find special forms of parody constituted as genres –satyr-drama, improvised comedy, satire, plotless dialogue [bessjuzentyj dialog] and others" (Bakhtin 1990: 59). Parody, then, is viewed as a constructive device which at least during the ancient Greek era produced some other genres and modes.

Another type of parody that Bakhtin discusses in his essay 'From the Prehistory of Novelistic Discourse' is the satyr play or the 'fourth drama' of the Hellenistic era. Referring to the figures of the satyr plays, Bakhtin asserts: "the most popular figure of the satyr play and other forms of the parodic travestying word was the figure of the "comic Hercules"" (Bakhtin 1990: 54). The satyr

plays of the ancient Greek drama were ridiculous imitations of one of the heroes of the trilogy –three tragedies – that preceded it.

Two other types of parody, which Bakhtin mentions in his essay 'From the Prehistory of Novelistic Discourse', are macaronic parody and 'parodia sacra'. He believes that during the Middle Ages in Europe macaronic parody was a common device used by literary writers. Macaronic parody is "an already fully developed, intentionally dialogized bilingual (and sometimes trilingual) hybrid" (Bakhtin 1990: 78). In macaronic parody, then, there are at least two different languages and one of these languages parodies the other language that already exists in the parody.

Bakhtin holds that 'parodia sacra' is yet another kind of parody which existed mainly in the medieval Europe (Bakhtin 1990: 71). 'Parodia sacra' is a parody of sacred texts and holy rituals. This kind of parody necessitates a degree of freedom in the society in which it is produced and "The Middle Ages, with varying degrees of qualification, respected the freedom of the fool's cap and allotted a rather broad license to laughter and the laughing word" (Bakhtin 1990: 72). This kind of freedom for the people of the Middle Ages was not an everyday freedom:

> This freedom was bounded primarily by feast days and school festivals. Medieval laughter is holiday laughter. The parodic-travestying "Holiday of Fools" and "Holiday of the Ass" are well known, and were even celebrated in the churches themselves by the lower clergy. (Bakhtin 1990: 72)

The festival laughter, then, was one of the roots of the 'parodia sacra' that Bakhtin considers as a kind of parody.

'Parodia sacra' is closely related to carnivalesque parody which Bakhtin prefers to enumerate as another kind of parody; however, a carnivalesque role can be attributed to almost all kinds of parody. During the festivals of the Middle Ages, people's freedom let them ridicule the sacred/authoritative discourse of their societies. Ridiculing the authoritative voice of the society establishes the grounds for its destruction. By permitting laughing at its subject,

carnivalesque parody takes a destructive role towards its original subject. The very destruction of the original subject of parody is the beginning of constructing a new subject in the form of parody (Bakhtin 1990: 58-59). Laughing at parody's original subject, however, can be seen in almost all the kinds of parody that Bakhtin mentions. It seems, thus, not deluding to deduce that Bakhtin accepts the carnivalesque role for parody, in general.

At the same time, the carnivalesque role of parody can be one of the positive goals for which parody might be used. Bakhtin refers to the goals of parody when in his *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics* he writes:

> Moreover, parodistic discourse itself may be used in various ways by the author: the parody may be an end in itself (for example, literary parody as a genre), but it may also serve to further other positive goals (Ariosto's parodic style, for example, or Pushkin's). (194)

The carnivalesque role of parody which results in creating new forms or new voices, then, can be regarded as one of the positive goals for which parody is used. From a Bakhtinian view point, then, parody has both a destructive goal and a creative one at the same time. It destroys its original subject in order to create a new substituting one.

The most important points that Bakhtin suggests or implies for defining parody can be referred to as parody's largely destructive nature towards its original subject (because of the presence of the elements of laughter and ridiculing in it), the necessity of making parody's subject clear in order for its reader to recognize parody's original subject, the range of parody's original subject that can vary from a verbal form of discourse to any typical social or individual way of thinking or seeing, and the destructive and creative nature of parody.

Although these points are his direct assertions about the definition of parody, Bakhtin's contribution to the definition of parody goes much further than this. Bakhtin's well-known concepts about language and literature are mainly evident in his dialogic criticism. Scrutinizing the concept of parody

under the light of some of the basic principals of Bakhtin's dialogic criticism can lead to a better clarification of the Bakhtinian outlook on parody.

Bakhtin's dialogic criticism promises that a literary work is

> a site for the dialogic interaction of multiple voices, or modes of discourse, each of which is not merely a verbal but a social phenomenon, and as such is the product of manifold determinants that are specific to a class, social group, and speech community. (Abrams 62)

Dialogism in and of the literary works, as Bakhtin holds, has two dimensions. One is that the literary work as a whole is like an utterance which necessitates an addressee to whom the utterance is addressed. At the same time, the literary work, like an utterance, is itself a response[1] to a previous utterance. Hence, a literary work is situated in the whole chain of literary works of past and present. Bakhtin carries this concept further by pointing to the whole chain of literary utterances as itself situated inside -and in a dialogic interaction with- the whole social and cultural milieu.

The other dimension of 'dialogism' is that in a single literary work there exist or rather co-exist different voices or languages which sometimes oppose one another; that is, the work possesses 'polyphony'. The mere existence of multi-voices in a single literary work not only represents 'polyphony' –as Bakhtin names it- but also undermines the dominant voice of that specific literary work. The undermining of the dominant voice can be in full bloom when these voices oppose one another or are all against a single dominant voice. This opposition of voices ultimately results in the inversion of the hierarchies of the voices and this is what Bakhtin terms 'carnivalesque'. As Simon Dentith explains, Bakhtin's concept of carnivalesque in literary works is taken from the late medieval and early Modern Europe's carnival ceremony, with its feasting, its celebrity enactments of the overthrowing of the authorial dominants in the society (Dentith 2000. 22-23). During the old carnival time

[1] In his *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays* Bakhtin uses 'response' in its broadest meaning. It is conceived that response "can assume various forms: educational influence on the readers, persuasions of them, critical responses, influence on followers, and so on" (75-76).

people were allowed a degree of freedom. This freedom let them ridicule and laugh at the sacred and holy issues. What lies in the core of the carnival ceremonies, and thereupon the carnivalesque concept in literary works, is the laughter whose main source is ridiculing.

Looking at parody in the light of Bakhtin's definition of it and his concepts of dialogism, polyphony, and carnivalesque will result in a deeper understanding of parody itself. Since one meaning of the dialogism of a literary work is its being a response to other literary works – or any cultural or social discourse[1] or product – the original subject of parody which is taken to be the direct object to which parody is a response can be any cultural or social product, not necessarily limited to verbal discourses. Since the parody work, like other literary works, necessitates an addressee to whom it is addressed and for whom it is created, parody must make its original subject so clear that parody's addressee can recognize it. Here comes the intention of the author, as well. For an author to respond to another social or cultural discourse and at the same time make his/her addressee aware of the subject that he/she parodies, there must be an element of deliberation or intention. In other words, the author must intentionally and purposefully parody a discourse otherwise the result loses the grounds to be called parody.

From the view point of Bakhtin's concepts of polyphony and carnivalesque, parody not only necessarily creates polyphony but also it represents the carnivalesque concept. By having at least two voices –one is the voice of the original subject of parody and the other is the voice of the author of the parody- parody allows polyphony to be established. Also, since parody draws on laughter regarding its original subject, it has a carnivalesque function. Even if parody does not evoke laughter towards its original subject, the mere presence of polyphony would be sufficient for the carnivalesque quality to be created. In other words, parody's function is a subversive or destructive one towards its original subject. However, the subversion or destruction of the

[1] Here discourse is not taken to be limited to verbal utterances. It rather means any social or cultural product.

authorial voice of the original subject of parody yields a new authorial voice to take the place of the previous one. Hence, parody is both destructive and creative at the same time.

2.2.2 Gerard Genette

In 1982, a comprehensive survey of the different modes of intertextuality, including parody, was performed by the French literary theorist Gerard Genette in his *Palimpsestes*. Genette's *Palimpsestes* is an attempt to offer hard and fast distinctions between the various types of the formal relations between texts; whether these relations are manifest or surreptitious. *Palimpsestes* offers the term 'hypertextuality' for any relationship between a text – called 'hypertext' – that is united, not in a manner of commentary, to an earlier text –named 'hypotext'(5). Genette attests that the relationships between hypertext and hypotext are of two types: one is 'transformation' and the other is 'imitation'. 'Transformation' can only exist for individual texts and 'imitation' for genres and styles:

> [A text] can be imitated only indirectly by using its idiolect to write another text; that idiolect cannot itself be identified except in treating the text as a model – that is as a genre. That is the reason why there can be only a pastiche of genre, and why imitations of an individual work, a specific author, school, an era, and a genre are structurally identical operations –and why parody and travesty, which do not go through that stage at all, can be defined in no circumstance as imitations but rather transformations – limited or systematic – imposed upon texts.
>
> (Genette 84)

Genette assigns the term imitation to the hypertextuality that is used in pastiche, because he believes that only genres can be imitated directly. On the other hand, the hypertextuality of a hypertext that uses another particular text or

author as its hypotext can be called transformation. Contrary to pastiche, parody and travesty always rely on transformation:

> A parody or a travesty always takes on one (or several) individual text(s), never a genre … One can parody only particular texts; one can imitate only a genre (a corpus, no matter how narrow, that is treated as a genre). (Genette 84-85)

The distinction between transformation and imitation is actually viewed by Genette as the distinction between parody and travesty on the one hand, and pastiche and caricature on the other.

Genette goes on to draw the borderline between parody and travesty. This borderline, he claims, is the same borderline between pastiche and caricature. The criteria for discerning this distinction is taken to be the 'mood' of these types of hypertextualities. Genette distinguishes between three major moods: playful, satirical, and serious. Nonetheless, he does not fail to consider the overlapping of these moods. The mood of parody, like pastiche, is playful. The mood of travesty, like caricature, is satirical. The serious mood is allotted to transportation and forgery. The summary of all the above distinctions is provided by Genette in the following table:

Table 1.

Mood / Relation	Playful	Satirical	Serious
Transformation	PARODY	TRAVESTY	TRANSPORTATION
Imitation	PASTICHE	CARICATURE	FORGERY

(Source Genette 28)

Transformation is assigned to transportation in relation to its hypotext. Forgery, on the other hand, uses imitation in relation to its hypotext. The common ground between forgery and transportation is considered to be their serious mood. The dotted lines in the above table are to represent the overlapping of

these moods; that is, there is not a sharp clear-cut distinction between the playful mood and the satirical one on the one hand and between the satirical mood and the serious one on the other.

Genette believes that parody as a kind of hypertextuality transforms its original subject – hypotext – and it must treat it in a playful mood not a satirical or serious one. He reserves the term transformation only for particular texts. This restriction is more clarified in Genette's most frequently quoted definition of parody which sees it "as being in general a minimal transformation of a text" (Rose 161 and Hutcheon 21).

There are some advantages and disadvantages regarding Genette's definition of parody. The advantage of his view, as Dentith in his *Parody* confirms, is that it focuses "attention on the specific formal operations that the hypertexts perform and provides some useful vocabulary for describing them" (14). Linda Hutcheon in her *A Theory of Parody: The Teachings of Twentieth-Century Art Forms* finds another merit in Genette's definition of parody. She writes: "what is good about [Genette's] definition is its omission of the customary clause about comic or ridiculing effect" (21). Hutcheon has a liking for Genette's definition of parody because she insists on broadening the scope of parody in her own definition of it[1]. On the other hand, there are some other critics who find this aspect of Genette's definition a disadvantage. For instance, M. A. Rose in her *Parody: ancient, modern, and postmodern* attacks Genette's definition in this respect: "[Genette's definition of parody] omits reference to its comic functions and to their many particular complexities as well as to other of its characteristics" (181). Then, accepting Genette's omission of comic or ridiculing element in defining parody as a virtue seems a matter of debate.

In fact**,** Genette's definition of parody suffers from some disadvantages. The first one is that it lacks the historical and social dimensions in which and for which parody is created. Dentith in his *Parody* comments: "[Genette's

[1] Hutcheon's definition of parody lacks the comic aspect or ridiculing element. Broadly speaking she defines parody as "repetition with difference" (Hutcheon 101).

definition] loses sight of the social and historical ground in which that interaction occurs, and the evaluative and ideological work performed by parody" (14). Also, M. A. Rose refers to this demerit of Genette's definition of parody when she writes: "[Genette's] various typologies of parody, pastiche and travesty do not always reflect all the historical differences in the uses and understandings of those terms" (Rose 181). Even, Hutcheon who supports Genette's definition of parody for its scope refers to this disadvantage. Comparing her own definition of parody with Genette's, Hutcheon declares: "Genette's categories are transhistorical, unlike mine" (Hutcheon 21). In other words, Genette approaches texts and thereupon parody without considering the social and historical backgrounds, while without these backgrounds parody would seem as a sterile phenomenon and it would lose its pragmatic dimensions.

Moreover, Genette's definition of parody lacks any relation to parody's addressee and to its author. Linda Hutcheon addresses this shortcoming of Genette's definition of parody: "[Genette] rejects any definition of transtextuality that depends upon a reader (and implicitly upon an author) (Hutcheon 21)". Hutcheon continues and quotes Genette's original French words where he strongly rejects any consideration for the reader. She writes:

> It is unacceptable [for Genette to care for the reader of parody in his definition] because it is "peu maîtrisable" for a critic who is intent upon categorizing: "elle fait un crédit, et accorde un rôle, pour moi peu supportable, à l´activité herméneutique du lecteur[1].
> (Hutcheon 21)

Having no regard for the addressee of parody implies that the recognition of the hypotext in the hypertext is not taken into account, while this recognition is the first step in distinguishing a simple text from a text with hypertextuality.

In a pragmatic definition of parody, the intention of the author in creating a parody text cannot be totally ignored. What will it be called if an

[1] The translation of the French text can be "little controllable"… "it gives a credit, and grants a role, for me not very bearable to the hermeneutic activity of the reader".

author writes a text which turns out to be a parody of another text and that its author has not meant it to be so or has never seen or heard about the hypotext of his unintentional parody? Genette's definition of parody has no answer for such questions.

Another objection to Genette's definition of parody is that it endeavours to confine the scope of parody to short texts. In Genette's definition of parody as "minimal transformation of another text", Genette does not leave a place for large texts to bear the name of parody. In her *A Theory of Parody,* Hutcheon discusses this issue: "Gerard Genette … wants to limit parody to such short texts as poems, proverbs, puns, and titles, but modern parody discounts this limitation" (18). As Hutcheon argues the modern practice of parody does not advocate this confinement designated to parody by Genette. Among many examples of large parody texts one can refer to Cervantes' *Don Quixote* (Rose 5), while based on Genette's definition of parody *Don Quixote* as a text cannot be called a parody.

In sum, Genette's structural view point about parody and hypertextuality possesses the merit of introducing some useful vocabulary with clear-cut definitions. It also widens the scope of parody by eliminating the comic or ridiculing element. At the same time, his definition of parody suffers from some disadvantages. These disadvantages can be summed up as having no historical or social dimension, having no regard for the hermeneutic aspect of parody, and restricting the scope of parody to short texts.

2.2.3 Roland Barthes

Roland Barthes's poststructural outlook about language and literature is another illuminating concept under which parody can be studied. In his article "From Work to Text" (1977), Barthes challenges the traditional notions about literary works. His different outlook about literary works implies a different

perspective about the subject that is to be transformed or imitated in parody. Barthes**'**s other essay, "The Death of the Author" (1977), discusses the role of the author and the reader in the production of 'texts'. In the light of Barthes**'**s understanding of the author and reader, the author and reader of parody possess some other meanings compared to the traditional concepts about them.

Barthes's essay "From Work to Text" endeavours to distinguish a work from a text. Barthes believes that a work represents a sign which closes on a signified (Barthes 1989: 1007). On the contrary, a text does not and cannot rest on a single signified:

> The Text … practices the infinite deferment of the signified, is dilatory; its field is that of the signifier and the signifier must not be conceived of as "the first stage of meaning," its material vestibule, but, in complete opposition to this, as its *deferred action* … the *infinity* of the signifier refers not to some idea of the ineffable (the unnameable signified) but to that of a *playing*.
> (Barthes 1989: 1007)

Accordingly, a text furnishes several signifieds –meanings. This plurality of meanings "accomplishes the very plural of meaning: an *irreducible* (and not merely an acceptable) plural" (Barthes 1989: 1007). A text, thus, cannot be expected to yield a definite meaning or interpretation: "The Text is not a co-existence of meanings, but a passage, an over crossing; thus it answers not to an interpretation, even a liberal one, but to an explosion, a dissemination [of meanings]" (Barthes 1989: 1007). This view of the text, although based on the Saussurian Structural Linguistics, is a poststructural notion about the signifying system of the texts. Saussure holds that in a signifying system, which embraces enumerable signs, the signifier finally rests on a single signified; on the contrary, Barthes contends that there is no final single signified on which the signifier can rest.

If a 'text' is to be considered 'plural', as Barthes argues, it follows that the very plurality of the text does not let it be categorized under any single category, nor can it be put in a hierarchical system:

> The Text does not stop at (good) Literature; it can not be contained in a hierarchy, even in a simple division of genres. What constitutes the Text is … its subversive force in respect of the old classifications… [Then] the text poses problems of classification (which is furthermore one of its "social" functions). (Barthes 1989: 1007)

The old classifications and genres, then, are not applicable to the text. The borderlines between texts are not to be considered vivid and sharp if there are any. There is another significant implication in this argument. When there is no borderline between the texts, they must be considered as linked and mixed with other texts: "[the texts are] woven entirely with citations, references, echoes, cultural languages (what language is not?), antecedent or contemporary, which cut across it through and through in a vast stereophony" (Barthes 1989: 1008). The texts, then, are intertextual, but

> the intertextual in which every text is held, it itself being the text–between of another text is not to be confused with some origin of the text … the citations which go to make up a text are anonymous, untraceable, and yet *already read*: they are quotations without inverted commas. (Barthes 1989: 1008)

The texts, as Barthes believes, are plural both in their deferred signifieds and in their cutting across other texts. These are what cause Barthes to conclude: "the text is that space where no language has a hold over any other, where languages circulate (keeping the circular sense of the term)" (Barthes 1989: 1010). The text is a part of language in general; thus, if there is a need for classifying the texts, it is language that can be the true classification of the texts not genres.

The distinctions between 'work' and 'text' which Barthes tries to elaborate on are indeed not very sharp. Barthes refers to this point when he writes: "It would be futile to try to separate out materially works from texts" (Barthes 1989: 1006). The works may be or may contain texts**:**

> the work can be held in the hand, the text is held in language, only exists in the movement of a discourse (or rather, it is Text for the very reason that it knows itself as text); the Text is not

> the decomposition of the work, it is the work that is the imaginary tail of the Text; or again, *the Text is experienced only in an activity of production*. (Barthes 1989: 1006-1007)

The work, then, is more what Barthes ascribes to the physical existence of books while the text is often the processes of demonstration through language.

In the light of Barthes's outlook about texts, the subject of parody finds new implications. The subject of parody based on the traditional definition could be a genre and/or an individual work. Since the traditional concepts of genres and classifications are called into question by Barthes, there cannot be a parody of them. Moreover, since the text is no longer seen as an entity separate from other texts and the innumerable languages that construct it, the parody of 'a work' seems meaningless. The other aspect of Barthes's outlook is that he finds the text as languages in circulation and it can be applied to the subject of parody texts, as well. In other words, from a Barthesian view point the original subject of parody is 'language'.

In his other article, "The Death of the Author", Barthes pronounces another concept of poststructuralism; that is, how the traditional humanistic notions about the author and the reader are devoid of true meaning. The author was traditionally looked at as the origin of a work, as someone whose purpose and intention create and nourish the work. Denouncing this perspective, Barthes argues:

> Linguistics has recently provided the destruction of the Author with a valuable analytical tool by showing that the whole of the enunciation is an empty process, functioning perfectly without there being any need for it to be filled with the person of the interlocutors. Linguistically, the author is never more than the instance writing … language knows a 'subject', not a 'person', and this subject, empty outside of the very enunciation which defines it, suffices to make language 'hold together', suffices, that is to say, exhausts it. (Barthes 1988: 169)

Barthes rejects the concept of the author whose purpose, intention, control, and initiation effectuate the form and the meaning of a text because "the author enters into his own death, [when] writing begins" (Barthes 1988: 168).

Moreover, ascribing an author to the text means imposing "a limit on that text, to furnish it with a final signified to close the writing" (Barthes 1988: 171). Barthes proposes the name 'scriptor' to be replaced for the dead – or traditional– author.

The idea of 'the death of the author' can also be supported by Barthes's outlook about the plurality of texts, which was already discussed. Since

> the text is a multi-dimensional space in which a variety of writings, none of which original, blend and clash, [and] it is a tissue of quotations drawn from the innumerable centres of culture … the writer can only imitate a gesture that is always anterior, never original. (Barthes 1988: 170)

The writer, then, can do nothing but "to mix writings, to counter the ones with the others, in such a way as never to rest on any one of them" (Barthes 1988: 170). The birth of this 'scriptor', as Barthes understands, is simultaneous with the birth of the text.

Killing the author, Barthes replaces him/her with language. After all, the role of the author is simply being a space wherein the various codes of a systematic langue precipitate into a particular parole. Barthes points to this replacement when he writes:

> [It is necessary] to substitute language itself for the person who … [is] supposed to be … [the work's] owner. It is language which speaks, not the author; to write is, through a prerequisite impersonality …. to reach that point where only language acts, 'performs', and not 'me'. (Barthes 1988: 168)

Writing starts with the elimination of the very god-like author whose empty place is occupied by the language.

The death of the traditional concept of the author leads Barthes to focus on the role of the reader. The reader as the destination of writing is where the multiplicity of writing is to be turned. Barthes argues:

> The reader is the space on which all the quotations that make up a writing are inscribed without any of them being lost; a text's

> unity lies not in its origin but in its destination, yet this destination cannot any longer be personal: the reader is without history, biography, psychology; he is simply that *someone* who holds together in a single field all the traces by which the written text is constituted. (Barthes 1988: 171)

The concept of the reader, for Barthes, is not the traditional one either. The reader, like the author, is impersonal; the reader who is divorced from his/her history, biography, and psychology will not even be 'someone'. The reader will be more 'an act of reading' rather than 'someone'.

Scrutinizing the definition of parody from a Barthesian perspective about the author yields a different outlook on it. When the author is believed to be devoid of originality in his text, it seems absurd to talk about a particular author's manner, matter, or style. Thus, a particular author's manner or matter cannot be regarded as the subject of parody. Since it is the language that speaks, instead of the author, the subject of parody can only be language. Also, since assigning the author the attribute of being purposeful is negated by Barthes, the intention of the author in a parody text turns out to be meaningless. The text is itself a ground of the clashes between languages and one type of these clashes may be manifested by parody.

On the other hand, the reader of a parody, from a Barthesian point of view, is not the traditional reader whose recognition of the subject of parody is a key factor in the assessment of the success of the parody. The reader of parody, just like any other reader, is to be replaced by the impersonal act of reading. This attitude about the reader leaves no room for the definition of parody to have any regard for the parody's addressee.

2.2.4 Jacques Derrida

Another poststructuralist theory under which parody may be studied is Jacques Derrida's Deconstructionalist approach. Deconstruction, as Derrida

promises, focuses on the free play of the meanings of signs and thereupon texts and language in general, leaving no single determinate meaning to be assigned to them. Studying parody under the light of Derrida's ideas leads to the denial of the traditional authorial intention in creating parody. Also, it leads to the rejection of the traditional role of the reader in interpreting parody.

Deconstruction, as Derrida discusses, involves opposition to 'logocentrism' of any kind. Logocentrism is the term that Derrida uses "to describe all forms of thought which base themselves on some external point of reference" (Jefferson 113). Derrida uses the concept of 'différance' in order to challenge the concept of logocentrism. The term 'différance' is derived form the French 'différer' which means both 'to defer, postpone' and 'to differ, be different from'. Applying the concept of 'différance' to the concept of sign – and its signifier and signified – Derrida delineates how a signifier inevitably defers its signified by its difference from other signifiers.

This leads Derrida to conclude that the meaning of a sign or any element of language is never fully present because it depends on its association with other signs or elements to which it harks back and refers forward (Derrida 108-123). In other words, the full meaning or an unquestionable centre for meaning is never present and is indeed caught up in a continuous process of signification. Language is itself a sign system. The text, as a kind of language, will not rest on a single definite meaning; "language bears within itself the necessity of its own critique" (Derrida 113-114). Deconstructive criticism, thus, aims to demonstrate that any text undermines its own claim to have a determinate meaning. This leaves the reader to produce his/her own meaning out of it; however, these meanings will not be determinate and are caught up by and in an activity of semantic free play of meanings.

Reconsidering the traditional concept of the author of parody based on Derrida's ideas will result in a deeper understanding of it. Since the text possesses no definite meaning, including the author's intended meaning, and since the text undermines its claimed meaning and thereupon its author's intended meaning, the authorial intention in creating parody becomes

meaningless. From a deconstructionalist view point, then, the definition of parody must not embrace the intention of its author.

Moreover, viewed under the light of Derrida's deconstructionalist approach, the reader of parody loses its traditional meaning. The reader of parody, like any other reader, is not to come at a determinate meaning. Instead, parody's reader is to come at the free play of meanings; meanings which undermine the text's intended meanings.

In a deconstructive world of significations, a parodical text like any other text does not rest on a single definite meaning. The parodical text, in this view, manifests opposing meanings which make the whole meaning of the text impossible to be determined. The signification of the parodical text is free from both the intention of its writer and the single definite interpretation of its reader. Therefore, both the author and the reader of parody possess no significant place in determining a work as being parodical; therefore, the definition of parody needs to be devoid of them.

2.3 Parody: Towards an Applicable Definition

The chronological pre-twentieth century's definitions of parody, which were glanced over in the previous parts of this chapter, aimed to briefly sketch the original definitions of parody and how they changed and developed through the history of English literature. The twentieth century's concepts, which were demonstrated earlier could exhibit the variety of perspectives through which parody can be scrutinized. Based on the old and modern definitions of parody, this study proposes a definition of parody which may not be an all-accepting comprehensive one; however it may prove to be an applicable one regarding the focus of this study which is studying parody in Tom Stoppard's *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern Are Dead*, *The Real Inspector Hound*, and *Dogg's Hamlet, Cahoot's Macbeth*.

In this study the definition of parody is mainly based on the extended ideas of M. M. Bakhtin and G. Genette. Parody, then, can be defined as a deliberate imitation or transformation of a socio-cultural product that takes at least a playful stance towards its original subject.

The proposed definition of parody stresses the authorial intention in creating parody. The author's intention is taken into account following the lead of Bakhtin; while from a Barthesian perspective the existence of the adjective 'deliberate' in the proposed definition of parody cannot be acceptable. The existence of the author's intention in the proposed definition of parody leads to rejecting as parody those texts– for this study, those imitations of Stoppard– that unintentionally use another text, discourse, or social product as their hypotext; whether the author knows about the existence of such hypotexts or has not intended to imitate them. If an author is not aware of the existence of a hypotext that is unintentionally parodied in his/her text, the attitude of that text toward its hypotext will be a haphazard unintentional one. In other words, the attitude of that text towards its hypotext will not be an authentic one since the author of that text has not known the existence of such a hypotext.

Based on the proposed definition of this study, a parody may imitate or transform its hypotext. Although Genette dismisses 'imitation' in his definition of parody, the proposed definition in this study accepts imitation as one of the ways by which the hypotext of parody can be used in parody. If only transformation is to be accepted for the definition of parody, parody will be confined to titles and very short texts.

Following the lead of Bakhtin, this study considers a range of subjects as the hypotexts of parody. The hypotext of parody can be a particular text's or a specific writer's manner, matter, tone, style, diction, attitude, or idea; it can be a literary genre or any mode associated with writing whether literary or non-literary; the hypotext of parody can also include any kind of socio-cultural product. From the view point of Barthes and Derrida, a particular text, a specific writer's style, and a genre cannot be accepted as the hypotexts of parody since they are not pure as they seem to be; that is, they do not possess an

entity which could be self-sufficient and could exist without the existence of the associated entities. Accepting the poststructural notions of Barthes and Derrida, however, this study proposes the cited hypotexts of parody not as entities segregated from the other associated entities – texts, authors, genres, language – but as some useful vocabulary to be able to examine parody in Stoppard's plays.

In the proposed definition of parody, the attitude of parody towards its hypotext includes a playful one. This idea is originally taken from Genette's definition of parody; however, the word 'playful' in this study does not have the same implications that Genette attributed to it. The playful attitude of parody, as applied in this study, can be taken together with a range of other attitudes, such as the evaluative or non-evaluative, ironical or satirical, and derisive or admiring attitude of parody toward its hypotext. The plurality of attitudes of parody towards its hypotext does not exclude the playful one; otherwise, the hypertextuality of a text can be interpreted as allusion, satire, travesty, pastiche, cento, etc.

Parody can be divided into different kinds based on its various hypotexts. Bakhtin enumerates some kinds of parody based on its hypotext, such as genre parody, satyre play, parodia sacra, etc. If the kinds of parody are not to be categorized based on some categories of hypotexts, it seems that there will be the possibility of having innumerable kinds of parody because there are innumerable hypotexts for parody. It is more appropriate to assume some categories for the different hypotexts of parody and based on that divide parody into some categories. As mentioned before**,** Simon Dentith in his *Parody* divides parody into two groups. One is specific and the other one is general parody. The specific parody "consists of a parody of a specific art-work or piece of writing …[while] general parody takes as its hypotext not one specific work but a whole manner, style or discourse" (Dentith 193-194). To be able to divide parody into some kinds, this study expands Bakhtin's outlooks and Dentith's views. Three categories can be assumed for parody. One is specific parody which takes as its hypotext a specific text's or writer's manner, tone,

style, diction, attitude, or idea. The next one is genre parody which has a genre or a generic style as its hypotext. The concept of genre is used to include any kind of genre or mode of writing, in general. It can be a literary genre or a non-literary one. The last but not the least important kind of parody is discourse parody. Discourse parody takes as its hypotext any type of human activity from verbal to non-verbal forms. At the same time, this vast group includes all kinds of parodies save the mentioned specific and genre parodies.

Based on the range of parody's attitudes toward its hypotext, the functions of parody can vary. Since the attitude of parody towards its hypotext can be an evaluative one, its function can range from a destructive stance toward its hypotext to an appreciative one. Moreover, since the attitude of parody toward its hypotext can be non-evaluative, the function of parody can be a playful creative one. It seems that whether the function of parody is to destroy its hypotext or not, it has a playful creative function, at large. It is possible, then, to accept a range of functions and goals for parody; however, there is a common function in all kinds of parodies and it is the playful creation/recreation of the hypotext.

CHAPTER 3

ROSENCRANTZ AND GUILDENSTERN ARE DEAD

Tom Stoppard was born Tomas Straussler to a Jewish family in Zelin, Czechoslovakia on July 3rd, 1937. His family moved to Singapore to escape the Nazis in 1939. A few years later, at the height of World War II, the family moved to Darjeeling, India, leaving Tomas's father in Singapore. Later Tomas's father, a doctor, escaping the invading Japanese drowned on his way to join his wife and sons. In India, Tom's mother met and married Kenneth Stoppard, a major in the British army. The family moved to Bristol, England, in 1946. Bored with academics, Tom Stoppard left school at age seventeen and began working as a journalist, reviewing plays and writing news features for small newspapers. He was made a theatre critic for *Scene* magazine in London in 1962. It was around this time that he also started writing plays for the radio and television; such as *A Walk on Water* (1963) and the *Dissolution of Dominic Boot* (1964)[1]. He wrote a one-act play called *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern Meet King Lear* in 1964 and it is this prototype play that he expanded into three acts and modified its title as *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern Are Dead*.

Rosencrantz and Guildenstern Meet King Lear was written in verse when Tom Stoppard was in Berlin as a recipient of a Ford Foundation grant for young playwrights. This one-act farce was performed by amateurs for an informal theatrical festival at a theatre on Kurfürstendamm at the end of Stoppard's six month's tenure (Hu 29). On his return to England Stoppard expanded the play into two acts (Jenkins 1989:38). Later Stoppard transformed his lines into prose and lengthened the play into three acts, ultimately titling it

[1] For a detailed list of Stoppard's works and his biography see Appendix A.

Rosencrantz and Guildenstern Are Dead. Talking about the genesis of his play, Stoppard asserts:

> My agent picked up my interest in Rosencrantz and Guildenstern and suggested a comedy about what happened to them in England. For good measure, he added that the king of England might be Lear. The possibility appealed to me and I began working on a burlesque Shakespeare farce. By the autumn of 1964 I had written a bad one, but had got interested in characters as existential immortals. I scrapped the play and in October 1964 started *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern Are Dead*, set not in England but within the framework of *Hamlet*. Jeremy Brooks at the Royal Shakespeare Company heard about it and asked for it, and I sent him two completed acts in April 1965. A few weeks later, amid much reported enthusiasm, the RSC commissioned the third act. (Brassel 35)

The finished three-act *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern Are Dead* was first presented on the fringe of the Edinburgh Festival by the Oxford Theatre Group in 1966[1]. About a year later the Royal Shakespeare Company took a twelve-month option on the play. This version of the play was also substantially revised before it was performed by the National Theatre. Stoppard recalls the first productions of the play and how he revised the script:

> [The first production which was by Oxford students on the Edinburgh Festival fringe] was done in a church hall on a flat floor so that people couldn't actually see it. There was no scenery, student actors. The director didn't show up. Someone else filled in. I turned up for thirty-six hours and tried to put a few things right. I added a scene. Laurence Olivier pointed out that the section in which they're asked by Claudius to go and find Hamlet after he's killed Polonius ought to be in the play. So I went off and wrote that. (Page 15)

Whatsoever changes Stoppard made to the play, the National Theatre at Old Vic produced the first London production of it in April 1967. This production was the first professional production of the play. The Alvin Theatre in New York produced the play in October of that year and Stoppard's play thereby

[1] For a detailed list of the notable productions of the play see Appendix B.

became the first production by Sir Laurence Olivier's National Theatre to appear in New York (Hu 31).

The Old Vic Theatre production of the play brought Stoppard immediate success and fame. The awards won by the play are the Evening Standard Award for Most Promising Playwright -in 1967- the Plays and Players Best Play Award -in 1967- and the John Whiting Award[1] -in 1967. It also earned the Tony Award for Best Play of the Season in 1968 and The New York Drama Critics' Circle Award for Best Play of the Year in 1967-1968.

Rosencrantz and Guildenstern Are Dead was rewritten as a film script and finally filmed in 1990. Stoppard himself was the writer of the film script and its director. The idea of filming *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern Are Dead* started in 1967 when Stoppard wrote a screenplay of it which had sixty-eight scenes. The project of filming the play was dropped until 1987 when Stoppard's first draft of this version of the film script had only 38 scenes. The 1982 film script of the play became the shooting script for the 1990 film of it. This version had 54 scenes (Kelly 2002:89). This script was filmed and won Stoppard the Golden Lion at the Venice Film Festival in 1990 and Fantasporto's Directors' Week Award in 1991.

Although Stoppard changed the play script so many times, the 1967 version published by Grove Press seems to be his final version of the play. The play consists of three Acts. It opens with Rosencrantz and Guildenstern placing bets on the toss of a coin while traveling toward Elsinore. Guildenstern is perturbed that the coin has come down heads eighty-five times in a row while Rosencrantz sees nothing particularly amiss. The two men meet a group of traveling actors on the road. The lead who is called the Player tries to encourage them to pay to watch a private performance but Guildenstern is not interested and Rosencrantz will not give them enough money. Guildenstern persuades the Player to make several rigged bets, which the Player loses. Since the Player has no money, he offers the services of Alfred, a boy actor. Guildenstern asks the actors to perform a play instead. Before they can watch the play, however,

[1] Wole Soyinka for his *The Interpreters* was Stoppard's joint winner for this award.

Guildenstern and Rosencrantz find themselves at court, where they meet with Claudius, Gertrude, and Polonius. Claudius asks Rosencrantz and Guildenstern to spy on Hamlet. They decide to 'play at questions' in order to practice for their interview with the Prince. After Rosencrantz wins the question game, Guildenstern pretends to be Hamlet and Rosencrantz asks him questions. Hamlet, then, arrives. In Act II after a disastrous interview with Hamlet -he asks them 27 questions and only answers three- Rosencrantz and Guildenstern try to figure out which way the wind is blowing. They, then, meet with the Player, who is angry with them for leaving his troupe's performance, but who eventually tries to help them figure out what is going on with Hamlet. Claudius and Gertrude ask the two friends about Hamlet, and they reply that the interview went well. Rosencrantz and Guildenstern then watch a rehearsal of the play *The Murder of Gonzago*, which is based on the story of Hamlet. The actual performance of the play breaks up because it has upset King Claudius. Claudius informs Rosencrantz and Guildenstern that Hamlet has killed Polonius and asks them to find him, which they do. When Rosencrantz and Guildenstern think that they have finished their task, they learn that they are to accompany Hamlet to England. Act III begins with Rosencrantz and Guildenstern finding themselves on a boat bound for England and carrying a letter addressed to the king of England; the letter tells him to have Hamlet's head cut off. They discover that Hamlet and the Players are also on board the ship. The ship is attacked by pirates, and Rosencrantz and Guildenstern learn that Hamlet has switched the letters: now they are the ones who are to be executed in England. The Players show their skill at killing and dying, and Rosencrantz and Guildenstern disappear. The final scene is the same as the ending of *Hamlet*: the stage is littered with the bodies of Gertrude, Claudius, Laertes, and Hamlet. Horatio then offers to tell the story to Fortinbras and the Ambassadors from England.

Theatre is a kind of communication medium that depends on live performances. Excluding the closet dramas that are intended by their authors to be read rather than to be performed, a playwright writes a play script to serve

primarily as a blueprint for production. Stoppard's plays are also constructed to be performed rather than to be consumed by a reader mentally in privacy. Stoppard himself claims that his plays are written "to entertain a roomful of people" (Ambushes 6). In spite of these facts there is the possibility of analyzing Stoppard's plays under the light of the techniques that he utilizes to write them. Parody is the common technique that Stoppard applies in his *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern Are Dead*, *The Real Inspector Hound*, and *Dogg's Hamlet, Cahoots Macbeth*.

In his *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern Are Dead* –hereafter, it is referred to as *RAGAD*- Stoppard exhibits miscellaneous parodies. These various parodies can be roughly grouped under three major categories: 'parody of Shakespeare's *Hamlet'*, 'parody of Beckett's *Waiting for Godot*', and 'other scattered parodies' which include his other less extended parodies.

3.1 Parody of Shakespeare's *Hamlet*

3.1.1 Characters

The clearest and the most important parody in Stoppard's *RAGAD* is the 'specific parody' of Shakespeare's *Hamlet*. Broadly speaking, Stoppard's parody of *Hamlet* in this play can be analyzed under three major groups: the characters, the plot, and the themes. Stoppard's parody of the characters of *Hamlet* is not confined to Rosencrantz and Guildenstern –hereafter, they are referred to as Ros and Guil. He parodies Hamlet as well as some of the other characters of Shakespeare's play. Even sometimes the characters of Stoppard's play parody some other characters of *Hamlet*, rather than their own counterpart characters.

3.1.1.1 Rosencrantz and Guildenstern

3.1.1.1.1 Action/Speech -Onstage/Offstage

Stoppard's parody of Ros and Guil, as characters, can be seen in the transformation of their speeches in *Hamlet* to dramatic actions in Stoppard's play and in their exact words or sentences that are used with different meanings. The title of *RAGAD* is taken from the English ambassador's speech at the end of *Hamlet* who announces that "Rosencrantz and Guildenstern are dead", expecting to be thanked for accomplishing the orders of the king of Denmark, Claudius. Right from the title of the play the spectator/reader of *RAGAD* understands the connection between this play and Shakespeare's *Hamlet*. This connection, however, becomes clearer when the play starts showing "*two* ELIZABETHANS *passing the time in a place without any visible character*" (RAGAD 11). Recognizing Ros and Guil as the famous minor characters of *Hamlet* becomes easier when Ros explains the reason why they are there:

> ROS: We were sent for.
> GUIL: Yes.
> ROS: That why we're here. (*He looks round, seems doubtful, then the explanation*.) Traveling.
> GUIL: Yes.
> ROS: (*dramatically*): -It was urgent - A matter of extreme urgency, a royal summons, his very words, official business and no questions asked. (RAGAD 19)

The spectator/reader becomes almost sure of the identity of the two characters when Ros introduces himself and Guil to a band of players:

> ROS: My name is Guildenstern and this is Rosencrantz.
> Guil *confers briefly with him*.
> (*Without embarrassment*.) I'm sorry –*his* name's Guildenstern, and *I'm* Rosencrantz. (RAGAD 22)

Ros and Guil later find themselves in front of the king of Denmark, Claudius, and his queen, Gertrude, while just before this scene Hamlet and Ophelia's confrontation is presented mutely (RAGAD 34-35).

Recognizing the central characters of *RAGAD* as the minor characters of Shakespeare's *Hamlet*, the spectator/reader finds some differences between their characterizations in the plays. The first difference is that in *Hamlet,* these two characters are minor characters whose existence for the plot of the play does not seem to be vital. In some performances of *Hamlet,* they are even entirely omitted from the plot, like Laurence Olivier's well-known movie of *Hamlet*. Contrary to their insignificant role in *Hamlet*, Ros and Guil have become the protagonists of Stoppard's play and the play is named after them.

The other difference between the characterizations of Ros and Guil in *Hamlet* and *RAGAD* is the onstage/offstage actions and speeches that are presented. Stoppard's play starts with the offstage actions and speeches of Ros and Guil in *Hamlet*. In *Hamlet* Ros and Guil appear for the first time when they have just reached the king's castle and they are in front of Claudius and Gertrude who explain the reason for their hasty sending for them. While Shakespeare's play does not show how Ros and Guil reach the castle of Elsinore nor does it present what happens to them on the way, Stoppard's play commences with Ros and Guil on their way to Elsinore. Focusing on Ros and Guil as the central characters of his play who need more detailed characterization compared to *Hamlet*'s Ros and Guil, Stoppard imaginatively creates the conversations and actions of Ros and Guil on their way to the king's castle: Ros and Guil are playing coin tossing while they encounter a band of players. The idea of coin tossing seems to be Stoppard's own while the idea of meeting the players by Ros and Guil on their way to Elsinore comes from Shakespeare's *Hamlet* where in the first scene between 'Ros and Guil' and Hamlet, Ros talks about it:

> Hamlet: Why did you laugh then,
> when I said 'Man delights not me'?

> Rosencrantz: To think, my lord, if you delight not in man, what lanten
> entertainment the players shall receive from you. We coted them on the way, and hither are they coming to offer you service.
> (II.ii.963-967)

The meeting of the players by Ros and Guil is only referred to by Shakespeare while Stoppard dramatizes it in great detail.

Not only does Stoppard dramatize Ros's sentence, that "we coted them \ on the way and hither they come to offer you service", but also he creates an atmosphere that is far different from Shakespeare's play. In *Hamlet* when Ros reports that he and Guil have spotted a band of players on their way to Elsinore, he is reporting as a gentleman to a member of royalties. He speaks solemnly using blank verse. Contrary to this solemnity is the playful dramatization of this meeting in *RAGAD.* From the beginning of Stoppard's play to the time that Ros and Guil are seen in Elsinore in front of the king and the queen, the language that is used by Ros and Guil is the mid-twentieth century prose English. Stoppard adds to the playfulness of his dramatization by creating playful and even sometimes comic scenes; scenes like when Ros and Guil introduce themselves to the players or when they bet with the Player on the year of their birth.

Stoppard creates a comic scene by having Ros introduce himself and his friend to the band of the players they have just met by misnaming himself and Guil and then correcting his mistake:

> ROS: My name is Guildenstern, and this is Rosencrantz.
> *GUIL confers briefly with him*.
> (*Without embarrassment*.) I'm sorry –*his* name's Guildenstern, and *I'm* Rosencrantz. (RAGAD 22)

This comic scene is followed by a further stress on the vagueness of the identities of 'Ros and Guil' for Ros:

> PLAYER: A pleasure. We've played to bigger, of course, but quality counts for something. I've recognized you at once ---
> ROS: And who are we?

PLAYER: -as fellow artists.
ROS: I thought we were gentlemen.
PLAYER: For some of us it is performance, for others, patronage.
They are two sides of the same coin or, let us say being as there are so many of us, the same side of two coins. (*Bows again*.) Don't clap too loudly -it's a very old world. (RAGAD 23)

Ros does not disclose his identity –as a courtier and as the close friend of the prince of Denmark- instead he points to the title that the Player applied to address him and his friend a bit earlier: "…to meet two gentlemen on the road---we would not hope to meet them off it" (RAGAD 22). The fact that Ros is not sure about his name is underlined in this scene; this fact is also stressed and repeated in the other parts of the play. Whatever effect this mistaking of the names and identities can have, it has at least an immediate comic effect. The whole scene recalls the vaudeville scenes where mistaken identities were used for comic effects.

There are still other scenes in *RAGAD* exhibiting the playful or comic stress of the first meeting between Ros and Guil and the band of the players. The betting scene between Guil and the Player can be another example. Guil plays the game of coin tossing with the Player. When the Player sees that he is losing repeatedly, he turns away to leave. Right then Guil offers the Player another betting game:

GUIL: Would you believe it? (*Stands back, relaxes, smiles*.) Bet me the year of my birth doubled is an odd number.
PLAYER: *Your* birth ---!
GUIL: If you don't trust me don't bet with me.
PLAYER: Would you trust *me*?
GUIL: *Bet* me then.
PLAYER: My birth?
GUIL: Odd numbers you win.
PLAYER: You're on ------
The TRAGEDIANS *have come forward, wide awake*.
GUIL: Good. Year of your birth. Double it. Even numbers I win, Odd numbers I lose.

> *Silence. An awful sigh as the* TRAGEDIANS *realize that any number doubled is even. Then a terrible row as they object. Then a terrible silence*. (RAGAD 30-31)

Guil bets on a simple mathematical rule that the Player and his band do not know; a rule that almost every high school student knows, let alone most of the theatre-goers, who are adults. The spectator/reader of this scene knows that the Player and his band are cheated because of not knowing a very simple mathematical rule and here lies the craft of the writer who establishes his playful scene on a dramatic irony.

These two examples demonstrate how Stoppard parodies Shakespeare's idea that Ros and Guil met a band of players on their way to the king's castle. Stoppard first expands the idea and changes it to an extended dramatic scene. He then modifies the serious and grave atmosphere of the tragedy of *Hamlet* to a playful, if not a comic, scene.

Stoppard's play exhibits another parody of Ros's and Guil's actions. After Dramatizing what happens to Ros and Guil on their way to Elsinore, Stoppard presents a scene from *Hamlet* where Claudius and Gertrude welcome Ros and Guil to the castle; Claudius and Gertrude explain the reason why they had sent for them. Despite the verbal closeness of this scene in Stoppard's play and *Hamlet*, Stoppard's play presents Ros and Guil in a diametrically different way from Shakespeare's drama. Shakespeare's stage direction for this scene in *Hamlet* (II.ii) indicates that the king and queen, along with Ros and Guil enter a room in the castle and there the scene commences. The stage direction in Stoppard's play, on the other hand, reads: "*But a flourish --enter* CLAUDIUS *and* GERTRUDE, *attended*" (RAGAD 35). This stage direction is preceded by Guil's imperative sentence addressing Ros: "Come on" (RAGAD 35). In other words, Ros and Guil are already there on the stage when Claudius and Gertrude enter. The effect of this change in Stoppard's play is the alteration of the importance of the characters. In Stoppard's play, the king and queen do not have the same importance and stature that they have in *Hamlet*. The king and queen go to see Ros and Guil and welcome them to Elsinore. Still more

important is the fact that Ros and Guil who are presented in Stoppard's play are two imbecile figures, characters that are not able to understand their world even though they are given enough clues –by the Player, for instance. Thus, having the king and queen go to them and welcome them modifies Shakespeare's high view point about the king and queen drastically.

After the stage directions in both of the plays, the scene in which the king and queen welcome Ros and Guil starts. Here Stoppard uses the same dialogues for the characters that Shakespeare uses; however, the stage directions that are only found in Stoppard's play radically alter the whole effect of the scene. In Stoppard's play the beginning of this scene reads:

> CLAUDIUS: Welcome, dear Rosencrantz … (*he raises a hand at* GUIL *while* ROS *bows*--GUIL *bows late and hurriedly*) … and Guildenstern.
> *He raises a hand at* ROS *while* GUIL *bows to him*--ROS *is still straightening up from his previous bow and halfway up he bows down again. With his head down, he twists to look at* GUIL*, who is on the way up.*
> Moreover that we did much, long to see you,
> The need we have to use you did provoke
> Our hasty sending.
> ROS *and* GUIL *still adjusting their clothing for* CLAUDIUS'S *presence*.
> Something have you heard
> Of Hamlet's transformation , so call it,
> Sith nor th'exterior nor the inward man
> Resembles that it was …. (35-36)

In the same scene in *Hamlet,* which has no stage directions, Ros and Guil are supposed to behave like two courtiers, two Gentlemen –they do nothing and politely listen to the king. On the contrary, the stage directions of this scene in Stoppard's play indicate that Ros and Guil whose names are uttered by the king interchangeably are confused and behave as two baffled courtiers. The playful spectacle of watching Ros and Guil confused and then 'adjusting their clothing' becomes funny when the spectators hear the king using the grave blank verse that Shakespeare uses in his 'tragedy' of *Hamlet*. The contrast between the language that the king uses and the situation of the characters on the one hand

and the puzzled behaviour of Ros and Guil on the other renders the whole scene funny.

Regarding the actions of Ros and Guil in the scene where Claudius and Gertrude welcome them to the castle, Stoppard's play parodies *Hamlet* from two perspectives. First, the stage direction added by Stoppard to the beginning of this scene indicates that Ros and Guil are on the stage when Claudius and Gertrude welcome them, as if Ros and Guil were more important than the king and queen. Contrary to this is the stage direction for this scene in *Hamlet* which indicates that the king, the queen, Ros, and Guil enter the stage together. The discrepancy between how Ros and Guil are treated in *RAGAD* and what they really are –two helpless characters who are impotent in understanding the world in which they are entangled- renders this part of the scene funny, compared to the grave tragic atmosphere of the same scene in Shakespeare's drama.

Second, when Claudius welcomes Ros and Guil in *Hamlet*, they are supposed to listen like two courtiers without any funny bafflement– there is no stage direction for this part in Shakespeare's play, thus nothing specific is supposed to happen while Claudius imparts the mission of Ros and Guil. On the contrary, the stage directions for Ros and Guil in Stoppard's play points out how they behave awkwardly, even clownishly, while Claudius welcomes them. Stoppard, hence, imitates this scene of Shakespeare's play and has his Ros and Guil act playfully, if not funnily; hence he parodies the actions of Ros and Guil in *Hamlet*.

3.1.1.1.2 Exact Words, Different Meanings

In his *RAGAD*, Stoppard sometimes uses the exact dialogues and words uttered by Ros and Guil in *Hamlet*; however, these dialogues and words are almost always meant by Stoppard to signify differently from their counterparts in Shakespeare's play. The first eye-catching example in the play can be

detected in the scene where Claudius and Gertrude welcome Ros and Guil to Elsinore. Responding to both Claudius and Gertrude who welcome them and disclose their mission, Ros and Guil assert respectively:

> ROS: Both your majesties
> Might, by the sovereign power you have of us,
> Put your dread pleasures more in to command
> Than to entreaty.
> GUIL: But we both obey,
> And here give up ourselves in the full bent
> To lay our service freely at your feet,
> To be commanded. (Hamlet II.ii.1046-1053, RAGAD 36)

Although the texts are exactly the same, Stoppard's application of them, and thereupon their meanings are thoroughly different from those of Shakespeare's drama. In *Hamlet* these words are spoken in the second scene of the second act of the play when spectators are undoubtedly aware of Hamlet's previously presented tragic predicament. In Stoppard's play these dialogues are uttered after a dumb show scene of the confrontation between Hamlet and Ophelia as the prince feigns madness -while this scene itself is after the scenes where Ros and Guil play tossing coins, which all land heads up, and then meet a band of ragged players. The spectators of Stoppard's play have met the prince only once so far –that is, in the previous dumb show.

Unlike *Hamlet,* the emphasis of which lies on prince Hamlet and his predicaments, Stoppard's play focuses on Ros's and Guil's predicaments and offers the least concern for prince Hamlet. Moreover, in Stoppard's play the aforementioned Elizabethan blank-verse lines are uttered when the audience has watched the previous scenes where Ros and Guil speak a mid-twentieth century prose English.

The contrasting styles of English –mid-twentieth century prose and Elizabethan blank verse used by Ros and Guil in the previous scenes and this one- are the sources of the playful effects of this scene on the spectators. Since Stoppard uses these dialogues without their overall context, in *Hamlet*, he

creates another point of contrast between the effect of these lines in his play and Shakespeare's.

Another major instance of Stoppard's copying of exact dialogues of Ros and Guil in *Hamlet* can be noticed in a short conversation that Ros has with the king and queen:

> *He* [GUIL] *turns upstage in time to take over the conversation with* CLAUDIUS, GERTRUDE *and* ROS *head downstage.*
> GERTRUDE: Did he receive you well?
> ROS: Most like a gentleman.
> GUIL: (*returning in time to take it up*): But with much forcing of his disposition.
> ROS: (*a flat lie and he knows it and shows it, perhaps catching* GUIL*'s eye):* Niggard of question but of our demands most free in his reply.
> GERTRUDE: Did you assay him to any pastime?
> ROS: madam, it so fell out that certain players
> We o'erraught on the way: of these we told him
> And there did seem in him a kind of joy
> To hear of it. They are here about the court,
> And, as I think, they have already order
> This night to play before him. (RAGAD 72-73)

Stoppard, here, copies the conversations, from *Hamlet* (III.i.1658-1669); the only printed differences are the stage directions that are not present in *Hamlet* while Stoppard adds them to this passage. In spite of the usage of the exact verbal dialogues of *Hamlet*, Stoppard's passage means differently and has some other effects on its reader/spectator, compared to that of Shakespeare's.

The first difference is that in Shakespeare's drama, indicated in the stage directions, all the involved characters of this scene enter the stage together. On the contrary, in Stoppard's play Ros and Guil are already on the stage when Claudius, Gertrude, and Polonius enter (72). Having Ros and Guil take the centre stage while the other characters –including the king and queen- go to them, displays the emphasis of Stoppard's play, which is obviously on Ros and Guil rather than Hamlet and on how they live outside and inside the tragedy of *Hamlet*.

The other non–verbal difference in this scene in both plays is how the reader/spectator is supposed to understand the same words uttered by Ros and Guil in each of the plays. The contexts of these scenes in both of the plays can lead to finding out the differences in the meanings intended by each playwright. In Stoppard's play before the royalties enter the stage, Ros is energetically telling stories which he cannot finish due to his inner irritation and frustration culminating from his situation; a situation that he and his friend are no able to understand and fail to control. The last lines of his dialogue before the entrance of the king and the other royalties explicitly elucidate his mindset:

> ROS: […](*He breaks out*). They're taking us for granted! (*He wheels again to face into the wings*) keep out, then. I forbid anyone to enter! (*no one comes. Breathing heavily*.) That's better. (RAGAD 72)

No sooner has he finished his words than in a grand procession the royalties enter the stage and the aforementioned conversation between Gertrude and Ros takes place. At the end of Ros's conversation with the royalties, Ros and Guil are left alone on the stage. Ros then addresses Guil: "Never a moment's peace! In and out, on and off, they're coming at us from all sides" (RAGAD 73). Ros's confusion that is itself the outcome of not understanding what happens around him is the reason for him to utter such words.

Contrary to the context of the aforementioned scene in Stoppard's play is the context in which the same scene appears in Shakespeare's drama. Before the first scene of act three in *Hamlet*, there is the well-known soliloquy of Hamlet starting with "Now I am alone,\ O what a rouge and peasant slave am I!" (II.ii.1589-1590). In this soliloquy Hamlet expresses his anger against himself for not acting and at the end of the soliloquy concludes: "…the play's the thing\Where I'll catch the conscience of the king" (II.ii.1644-1645). The next act then starts and the king and queen question Ros and Guil to see what they have gleaned from Hamlet. At the end of the royal inquiry Ros and Guil leave the stage and the royalties arrange for the counterfeit confrontation between Ophelia and Hamlet.

Comparing the context of the 'inquiry scene' in *Hamlet* and Stoppard's play reveals that in Shakespeare's play the least importance is given to the personalities of Ros and Guil and what is important for the reader/spectator is not who they are or what they think but what they say about the main character of Shakespeare's play. In Stoppard's play, as the context of the inquiry scene insinuates, no significance is given to what Ros and Guil say about Hamlet. The stress is put on how Ros and Guil feel and thereupon how they relate what they have gleaned from Hamlet to the royalties; this dimension of meaning is further underlined by the stage direction that is to be performed by Ros's facial expressions and body language: "*a flat lie and he knows it and shows it, perhaps catching* GUIL'*s eye*" (RAGAD 72). The gestures and behaviours which Ros and Guil display diminish the seriousness of the scene and turn the serious and solemn royal inquiry scene of *Hamlet* to a playful scene in Stoppard's play.

The other dimension of the difference of the 'inquiry scene' in the contexts of both plays is the contrast of language styles. The grandiose Elizabethan blank-verse of Shakespeare is what precedes the scene, continues in it, and follows after it in *Hamlet*. On the contrary, this versified scene is preceded and followed by an informal mid–twentieth century prose that constructs the dialogues between Ros and Guil. The incongruity between the language styles of the 'inquiry scene' and its context is still another source of its humorous effect on the reader/spectator of Stoppard's play.

Accordingly, although Stoppard has his Ros and Guil sometimes speak the same dialogues that they are assigned to in Shakespeare's *Hamlet*, he creates different meanings and effects –which are mostly directed towards entertaining a roomful of people, as he himself avers (Ambushes 6). Stoppard adds his playful attitude mainly by recontextualizing *Hamlet*'s dialogues. By creating the incongruity between the Shakespearian verse language of these dialogues and the mid-twentieth century prose context of them, Stoppard makes these dialogues have a playful, if not comic, effect on the reader\spectator. In

his play, thus, Stoppard parodies the characters 'Ros and Guil' even if they utter precisely the same dialogues that they articulate in Shakespeare's *Hamlet*.

3.1.1.2 Hamlet

3.1.1.2.1 Action/Speech -Onstage/Offstage

Explaining what his profession involves, the Player in *RAGAD* reveals one of the techniques that Stoppard employs to create his play out of Shakespeare's *Hamlet*. He proclaims: "We keep to our usual stuff, more or less, only inside out. We do on stage the things that are supposed to happen off. Which is a kind of integrity, if you look on every exit being an entrance somewhere else" (RAGAD 25). It is one of the parodying techniques that Stoppard implements in his *RAGAD* and he lets the Player announce it.

Hamlet, as the protagonist of Shakespeare's drama, is parodied as a minor character in Stoppard's *RAGAD*. The first time Hamlet appears in Stoppard's play (34-35) he is seen acting in a dumb show which dramatizes Ophelia's description of his non compos mentis demeanour in Shakespeare's drama (II.ii.971-997). Stoppard's stage direction for this dumb show is principally Ophelia's words in *Hamlet*:

> *And* OPHELIA *runs on in some alarm, holding up her skirts ... followed by* HAMLET.
> OPHELIA *has been sewing and she holds the garment. They are both mute.* HAMLET*, with his doublet all unbraced*, *no hat upon his head, his stockings fouled, ungartered and down-gyved to his ankle, pale as his shirt, his knees knocking each other…and with a look so piteous, he takes her by the wrist, and holds her hard, then he goes to the length of his arm, and with his other hand over his brow, falls to such perusal of her face as he would draw it…at last, with a little shaking of his arm, and thrice his head waving up and down, he raises a sigh so piteous and profound that it does seem to shatter all his bulk and end his being. That done, he lets her go, and with his head over his*

> *shoulder turned, he goes out backwards without taking his eyes off her…she runs off in the opposite direction.* (RAGAD 34-35)

Shakespeare's text reads:

> Ophelia: O my Lord, my Lord, I have been so affrighted,
> Polonius: With what i'th name of God?
> Ophelia: My lord, as I was sewing in my closet,
> Lord Hamlet, with his doublet all unbrac'd,
> No hat upon his head, his stockings foul'd,
> Ungartered, and down-gyved to his ankle,
> Pale as his shirt, his knees knocking each other,
> And with a look so piteous in purport
> [...]
> He took me by the wrist, and held me hard,
> Then goes he to the length of all his arm,
> And with his other hand thus o're his brow,
> He falls to such perusal of my face
> As he would draw it, long stayed he so,
> At last, a little shaking of mine arm,
> And thrice his head thus waving up and down,
> He raised a sigh so piteous and profound
> That it did seem to shatter all his bulk,
> And end his being; that done, he lets me go,
> And with his head over his shoulder turn'd
> He seem'd to find his way without his eyes,
> For out o' doors he went without their help;
> And to the last bended their light on me. (Hamlet II.ii.971-997)

The offstage action of Hamlet, narrated by Ophelia, is turned to a mute performance in Stoppard's play; a dumb show that neither exhibits the high opinion of Ophelia regarding the prince nor sketches the grand stature of Hamlet, the stature that has already been established by Shakespeare's drama.

There are numerous differences in presenting Hamlet as a character in this scene of Stoppard's play and its textual counterpart in Shakespeare's *Hamlet*. In Shakespeare's *Hamlet*, the reader/spectator has already read/watched the causes of Hamlet's turbulent mind. In Stoppard's *RAGAD*, however, this is the first time that Hamlet appears and whatever reason the reader/spectator surmises for Hamlet's lunatic behaviour must be recollected from Shakespeare's *Hamlet*. In *Hamlet*, Ophelia reports the scene having been

shocked by the uncanny behaviour of the prince. In Stoppard's play, it is performed mutely, showing Hamlet's behaviour not as queer but as lunatic. In other words, Shakespeare's drama illustrates Hamlet feigning madness while Stoppard's play parades Hamlet as a lunatic (Egri 38). In *Hamlet*, Polonius as the royal chancellor listens to his daughter's description of the event. In Stoppard's play, there is no Polonius watching or hearing the scene; there are, instead, Ros and Guil who are frozen dumb and are stupidly puzzled on the stage watching Hamlet acting insanely. In Stoppard's grotesque dumb show, Hamlet's stature is cut down to petty proportions; no more does he possess cosmic dimensions which are bestowed on him in Shakespeare's drama (Egri 38-39). In *Hamlet,* the scene is tragic. In Stoppard's play, it is comic. Hamlet, thus, is presented more as a comic figure than a tragic one in Stoppard's play: as a character, Hamlet is parodied.

There are still other examples where Stoppard alters the offstage actions or speeches of Shakespeare's Hamlet to playful onstage ones and by treating them playfully he, thus, parodies them. For instance, in Shakespeare's drama, Hamlet explains to Horatio what happened to him when he was on the sea (IV.vi.2987-2993) and how he changed the letter that Ros and Guil were to give to the king of England with a letter that he himself wrote and by that sent Ros and Guil to their deaths (V.ii.3512-3549). These narrated actions, which are supposed to have taken place offstage in *Hamlet*, are dramatized as onstage actions in the third act of Stoppard's *RAGAD* (97-126); however, Stoppard's creativity adds to the actions and modifies some parts, as well. The created scenes out of Hamlet's narration display Stoppard's playfulness in treating his subject; scenes like the funny reactions of Hamlet, the Player, Ros, and Guil to the attacking pirates which lead to their collision at the centre stage (118), or characters' hiding in the barrels and then disappearance of Hamlet (118-119). Stoppard, thus, not only turns the offstage actions of Hamlet, as narrated in Shakespeare's drama, to onstage ones but also treats them playfully; in other words, he parodies them.

In *RAGAD*, Stoppard shifts *Hamlet*'s centre of attention. *Hamlet*'s prime focus is on its main character, Hamlet. *RAGAD*'s main focus of attention, as the title represents, is on Ros and Guil, two minor characters in the plot of *Hamlet*. One of Stoppard's leading strategies to achieve this goal is to make Hamlet's actions and speeches less visible to the spectator/reader. Stoppard not only excludes most of Hamlet's actions and speeches, which are present in Shakespeare's drama, but also alters some of them to background or offstage ones. The result of these omissions and modifications is a minimalist presentation of Hamlet, as a character. The minimalist presentation of Hamlet in Stoppard's play is introduced not in *Hamlet*'s context but in Ros's and Guil's storyline, which dramatizes their insignificant and petty actions while they play in *Hamlet*'s plot. Stoppard's Hamlet is portrayed through the restricted view points of Ros and Guil and the result is a funny sketch of him. The high view point of Shakespeare about Hamlet is turned to a low and funny viewpoint of him in *RAGAD* and as a character he is parodied.

There are some scenes in *RAGAD* where Stoppard not only turns the actions and speeches of Shakespeare's Hamlet into background or offstage – minimalist presentation of him- but also dramatizes him playfully. For instance, Hamlet's great soliloquy starting with "to be or not to be – that is the question" (III.i.1710-1744) is minimally alluded to and is assumed to take place at the background in *RAGAD*. The stage direction for this soliloquy in Stoppard's play reads: "HAMLET *enters upstage, and pauses, weighing up the pros and cons of making his quietus.* ROS *and* GUIL *watch him*" (RAGAD 74). Ros and Guil are talking 'downstage' when Hamlet enters 'upstage'. They carry on talking while Hamlet is standing upstage. Their conversation is all of a sudden interrupted and Hamlet delivers his soliloquy while nothing of it is audible except the last line: "Nymph, in thy orisons be all my sins remembered" (RAGAD 75). Ophelia enters right at this moment and stops for Hamlet:

> OPHELIA: Good my lord, how does your honour for this many a day?
> HAMLET: I humbly thank you–well, well, well. (RAGAD 75)

As the stage direction indicates, just after Hamlet's words, both Hamlet and Ophelia disappear into the wing (RAGAD 75). There are several differences between the presentations of this scene in Stoppard's play and Shakespeare's drama. Shakespeare presents this scene leaving Hamlet alone on the stage and letting him enunciate his stream of thought loudly and heatedly. Stoppard, on the contrary, divides the stage into up and down. The downstage, which is nearer to spectators, presents the onstage –more important and serious– actions and speeches while the upstage part, which is farther to spectators, presents the background –less significant and serious– actions and speeches. Ros and Guil are talking downstage while they are briefly interrupted by Hamlet's upstage entrance and a bit later they, along with the audience, hear only the last line of Hamlet's soliloquy.

In Stoppard's play, Hamlet's heated and loud soliloquy turns to a silent mime show presenting him "weighing up the pros and cons of making his quietus". The onstage speech of Shakespeare's Hamlet is watched as an offstage speech. Instead of thirty-five lines of vehement blank verse showing the deep brooding mind of Hamlet, only a mime is seen and the last sentence, which does not show even a bit of Hamlet's state of mind, is heard in Stoppard's play. The result is not only a minimalist presentation of Shakespeare's Hamlet but also a comic one. After all, Shakespeare's dignified and thinking Hamlet who utters his doubts by his soliloquy "to be or not to be" is seen in the counterpart scene in Stoppard's play as a lunatic who makes gestures; he behaves like a carefree lover without anything to care for. He is not heard while making gestures and then all of a sudden: "Nymph, in thy orison be all my sins remembered" (RAGAD 75). Stoppard's Hamlet seems neither princely nor thoughtful.

After the "To be, or not to be" soliloquy, Shakespeare depicts his Hamlet talking with Ophelia. The conversation reveals the turbulent mind of a lover who rejects his beloved (III.i.1747-1805). It discloses, furthermore, how Hamlet's mind is doubtful about the concepts of honesty, beauty, and love. On

the other hand, having said the last line of the "to be or not be" soliloquy from Shakespeare's Hamlet, Stoppard's Hamlet replies to Ophelia's greetings: "I humbly thank you – well, well, well" (RAGAD 75); they then disappear into the wing. The conversation between Hamlet and Ophelia is supposed to take place offstage while Ros and Guil continue talking. Nothing of the passionate conversation between Hamlet and Ophelia is heard at this moment. The spectators of this scene of Stoppard's play have no clue, except what they recall from *Hamlet*, to appreciate Hamlet's line of thought. This scene of Stoppard's play, thus, represents Hamlet in a new context and in a minimalist way.

The conversation between Ros and Guil right after Hamlet's soliloquy points to their attitude not only about Hamlet's soliloquy but also about Hamlet himself:

> Ros: It's like living in a public park.
> Guil: Very impressive. Yes, I thought your direct informal approach was going to stop this thing dead in its tracks there. If I might make a suggestion—shut up and sit down. Stop being perverse. (RAGAD 75)

They have understood nothing about Hamlet's situation; rather they have misunderstood him. The contrast between the minimally-dramatized blank-verse soliloquy of Hamlet and the mid-twentieth century prose conversation between Ros and Guil, which points to their naïve understanding of the prince, generates humour for the reader\spectator of this scene.

In Stoppard's play, the other instance of modifying the onstage speech of Shakespeare's Hamlet to an offstage one and portraying him minimally and comically takes place just after the previously mentioned scene. From the time that Hamlet and Ophelia disappear into the wing to the time that they reappear, Ros and Guil talk and watch the rehearsal of the play that the players are to play before the royalties. While Ros and Guil are watching the play, Hamlet and Ophelia suddenly reappear and only the last lines of their passionate conversation, which appears in Shakespeare's drama (III.i.1747-1805), are heard:

> *The wail of a woman in torment and* OPHELIA *appears, wailing, closely followed by* HAMLET *in a hysterical state, shouting at her, circling her, both midstage.*
> HAMLET: Go to, I'll no more on't; it hath made me mad!
> *She falls on her knees weeping.*
> I say we will have no more marriages! (*His voice drops to include the* TRAGEDIANS*, who have frozen*.) Those that are married already *(he leans close to the* PLAYER–QUEEN *and* POISONER*, speaking with quiet edge*) all but one shall live. (*He smiles briefly at them without mirth, and starts to back out, his parting shot rising again*.) The rest shall keep as they are. (*As he leaves,* OPHELIA *to tottering upstage, he speaks into her ear a quick clipped sentence*.) To a nunnery, go.
> *He goes out.* OPHELIA *falls on to her knees upstage, her sobs barely audible. A slight silence.* (RAGAD 78)

From all of the ardent conversation between Hamlet and Ophelia only the beginning and the final sentences are heard on the stage. The image of Hamlet displayed by these initial and final lines of his dialogue is but the image of a cruel and lunatic lover. Compared to Shakespeare's astute and thoughtful Hamlet, who feigns madness to unveil the real nature of the king, Stoppard's image of the prince is a not only a minimal but also a comic one. Where the onstage actions and speeches of Shakespeare's Hamlet are depicted as offstage ones in *RAGAD*, Stoppard thus does not exhibit Shakespeare's Hamlet but a parody of him.

3.1.1.2.2 Exact Words, Different Meanings

In the portion of *RAGAD* where Hamlet is dramatized, Stoppard sometimes copies the precise words and sentences uttered by Shakespeare's Hamlet. These words and sentences, however, do not possess the same meanings and implications as they have in Shakespeare's drama; almost all of them culminate in a playful impact on the reader\spectator of Stoppard's play.

For instance, at the end of the first act where Ros and Guil meet Hamlet for the first time, Hamlet greets them by a mistake in naming them.

> GUIL: (*Calls upstage to* HAMLET): My honoured Lord!
> ROS: My most dear Lord!
> HAMLET *centred upstage, turns to them.*
> HAMLET: My excellent good friends! How dost thou Guildenstern? (*Coming downstage with an arm raised to* ROS, GUIL *meanwhile bowing to no greeting.* HAMLET *corrects himself. Still to* ROS:) Ah Rosencrantz!
> *They laugh good-naturedly at the mistake. They all meet midstage, turn usage to walk,* HAMLET *in the middle, arm over each shoulder.*
> HAMLET: Good lads, how do you both? (RAGAD 53)

Shakespeare's Hamlet uses the same words to greet Ros and Guil; however, he does not provide any stage direction:

> GUIL. My honoured Lord!
> ROS. My most dear Lord!
> HAMLET. My excellent good friend's! How dost thou, Guildenstern?
> Ah, Rosencrantz! Good lads, how do you both?
> (II.ii.1267-1271)

Although Stoppard's Hamlet articulates precisely the same words that Shakespeare's Hamlet utters, his words do not have the same meanings and effects as they have in Shakespeare's drama. The stage directions added by Stoppard to this scene of Shakespeare's *Hamlet* turn the royal status of the prince to that of an ordinary man. The cause of Hamlet's grief disappears because not only Stoppard does not show it in his play but also he represents Hamlet as an ordinary man who makes funny mistakes and puts his arms over his spy-friends' shoulders –as if he did not notice their mission and was enjoying his time with them. Shakespeare's Hamlet's intentions and causes are lost; his princely status is diminished; what remains is not Shakespeare's Hamlet but a parody of him.

There are still some other scenes in Stoppard's play where the parodied Hamlet uses the same words that his original character in Shakespeare's drama

asserts. Since Stoppard presents a few parts of Hamlet's speeches and since he does not present the character in his original context, all of the sentences and words uttered by Stoppard's Hamlet mean different things from his counterpart's words and sentences in Shakespeare's drama and have sharply different impacts and implications. Hamlet's final words in his "to be, or not to be" soliloquy (RAGAD 74-75) and his initial and final sentences in his conversation with Ophelia (RAGAD 75, 78) are two other instances which were already referred to in the previous section.

To sum up briefly, in his *RAGAD* Stoppard re-presents Shakespeare's Hamlet in two ways. He sometimes modifies his action to speech or his speech to action; in other words, he sometimes alters Hamlet's onstage speeches and actions to offstage ones or vice versa. Sometimes, Stoppard uses Hamlet's exact words and sentences. In both cases, Hamlet's actions and dialogues mean something different from what they mean in Shakespeare's drama and they result in a drastically different effect on the spectators. Wherever Hamlet is seen in Stoppard's play, he is far from the tragic hero of Shakespeare's drama. Stoppard nearly always portrays him minimally and playfully; thus, he parodies Shakespeare's Hamlet.

3.1.1.3 Claudius and Gertrude

Claudius and Gertrude are the other characters in Stoppard's play who are parodied. Claudius appears in Shakespeare's *Hamlet* as a smart traitorous king who does not seem to provide any ground for comic scenes. Stoppard's *RAGAD*, on the other hand, presents Claudius as a king who mistakes their names and provides grounds for comic scenes. The first time Claudius encounters Ros and Guil in Stoppard's play, he utters the same words that he remarks in the same scene in Shakespeare's *Hamlet*:

> *But a flourish–enter* CLAUDIUS *and* GERTRUDE, *attended*.
> CLAUDIUS: Welcome, dear Rosencrantz…(*he raises a hand at* GUIL *while* Ros *bows*–GUIL *bows late and hurriedly*) …and Guildenstern.
>
> *He raises a hand at* ROS *while* GUIL *bows to him*–ROS *is still straightening up from his previous bow and halfway up he bows down again. With his head down, he twists to look at* GUIL*, who is on the way up.*
> Moreover, that we did much long to see you, […]. (RAGAD 35)

The same part of the same scene in *Hamlet* reads:

> Flourish. [Enter King and Queen, Rosencrantz and Guildenstern]
> King: Welcome, dear Rosencrantz and Guildenstern,
> Moreover, that we much did long to see you, […].
> (II.ii.1019-1022)

Both texts are almost the same save for their stage directions. Stoppard's stage directions indicate that Ros and Guil are on the stage while Claudius and Gertrude enter while Shakespeare's states that all four characters enter the stage together. The impact of this change in Stoppard's play is a stress on the importance of Ros and Guil as major characters of the play. It also diminishes the status of the king and queen because they are the ones who go to visit the two comic figures. The comic dimension of Stoppard's play is enhanced by the stage direction that follows and describes how the king mistakenly calls Ros and Guil crossway.

Having heard their names, Ros and Guil bow to the king while each time the king names one of them, he raises a hand at the other one. The scene is theatrically comic and the character who provides the grounds for the joke is the king, Claudius. The scene continues and it becomes Gertrude's turn to greet Ros and Guil:

> GERTRUDE: Good (*fractional suspense*) gentlemen …
> *They both bow*.
> He hath much talked of you. (RAGAD 36)

In Shakespeare's *Hamlet*, Gertrude applies the same words. The only difference between this scene in Shakespeare's drama and its counterpart in Stoppard's play is the stage direction in Stoppard's play, which insinuates that Gertrude like Claudius does not know which one is Ros and which one is Guil. Noticing her awkward situation, that she does not know which is which, Gertrude prefers to address them together by using the plural noun "gentlemen", of course, after a bit of thought which is referred to as "*fractional suspense*". A bit later, when Gertrude decides to thank Ros and Guil, again she uses the same words that she uses in the same scene in Shakespeare's drama:

> GERTRUDE: (*correcting*): Thanks Guildenstern (*turning to* ROS, *who bows as* GUIL *checks upward movement to bow too–both bent double, squinting at each other*)… and gentle Rosencrantz (*turning to* GUIL, *both straightening up*–GUIL *checks again and bows again*). (RAGAD 37)

As in the previous part, Stoppard only adds the stage directions. In this part, Gertrude, like Claudius, prepares the ground for a theatrical comedy by her tone and pauses as well as her gestures and movements.

Although, Claudius and Gertrude who are dramatized in Stoppard's play use more or less the same words that they use in the counterpart scenes in Shakespeare's *Hamlet*, they look not as majestic and royal as Shakespeare displays them. The stage directions that Stoppard mostly adds to their dialogues, and sometimes in between them, create a king and queen who name Ros and Guil by mistaking one for the other. By so doing, the king and queen prepare the ground for funny theatrical comedy that Ros and Guil exhibit by reacting to the king's and queen's gestures and speeches. Although the joke is mainly about Ros and Guil, it also embraces Claudius and Gertrude because they are the triggers of it and they interact with those whom the joke is on. Claudius and Gertrude as presented in Stoppard's play are not the same royal king and queen introduced in Shakespeare's *Hamlet*; they are parodies of the same characters.

3.1.1.4 Characters Parodying Other Characters

Stoppard's *RAGAD* not only displays some characters that are parodies of their counterpart characters in Shakespeare's *Hamlet* but also introduces some characters who parody some other characters of *Hamlet*. There are many instances of this kind of parody in Stoppard's play. One example can be detected a bit after the meeting between the 'king and queen' and 'Ros and Guil':

> ROS: What are you playing at?
> GUIL: Words, words…. (RAGAD 41)

Guil's reply to Ros is actually Hamlet's reply to Polonius in Shakespeare's drama:

> Polonius: [...] What do you read my Lord?
> Hamlet: Words, words, words. (II.ii.229-1230)

Hamlet's reply to Polonius's question is a witty one which is understood by the spectators to be a way of making fun of Polonius, escaping the true answer, and feigning madness. When Guil employs Hamlet's "words, words" he is answering Ros's question in an honest way because he has been indeed playing at words. For the spectators, however, Guil's reply is furthermore a reminiscent of the well-known Prince's witty reply to Polonius, which is used not wittily in a context different from *Hamlet*'s and by a character whose previous remarks -which caused Ros to ask "what are you playing at?"- are rather comic than witty. The dichotomy between the situations, contexts, and characters as presented in both plays make Guil's remark -compared to Hamlet's– comic. Guil, thus, parodies Hamlet's reply to Polonius.

There is yet another example in Stoppard's *RAGAD* where a character parodies another character of Shakespeare's *Hamlet*. Before Hamlet appears to weigh up the pros and cons of his great soliloquy, Ros and Guil talk about being dead in a box:

> ROS: […] Do you ever think of yourself as actually *dead*, lying in a box with a lid on it?
> GUIL: No.
> ROS: Nor do I, really.…It's silly to be depressed by it. I mean one thinks of it like being alive in a box, one keeps forgetting to take into account the fact that one is *dead* … which should make all the difference…shouldn't it? I mean, you'd never *know* you were in a box, would you? It would be just like being *asleep* in a box. Not that I'd like sleep in a box, mind you, not without any air-you'd wake up dead, for a start, and then where would you be? Apart from inside a box. That's the bit I don't like, frankly. That's why I don't think of it….
> GUIL *stirs restlessly, pulling his cloak round him.*
> Because you'd be helpless, wouldn't you? Stuffed in a box like that, I mean you'd be in there for ever. Even taking into account the fact that you're dead, it isn't a pleasant thought. *Especially* if you're dead, really…*ask* yourself, if I asked you straight off-I'm going to stuff you in this box now, would you rather be alive or dead? Naturally, you'd prefer to be alive. Life in a box is better than no life at all, I expect. You'd have a chance at least. You could lie there thinking-well, at least I'm not dead! In a minute someone's going to bang on the lid and tell me to come out. (*Banging the floor with his fists.*) "Hey you, whatsyername! Come out of there!"
> GUIL (*jumps up savagely*): You don't have to flog it to death!
> *Pause.*
> ROS: I wouldn't think about it, if I were you. You'd only get depressed. (*Pause.*) Eternity is a terrible thought. I mean, where's it going to end? (RAGAD 70-71)

A bit later Hamlet appears preparing for his great soliloquy and then only the last line of it is heard. The soliloquy that is briefly referred to in Stoppard's play and is parodied by Ros, in his speech about 'being dead in a box', is in Shakespeare's drama:

> Hamlet: To be, or not to be- that is the question:
> Whether 'tis nobler in the mind to suffer
> The slings and arrows of outrageous fortune
> Or to take arms against a sea of troubles,
> And by opposing end them. To die- to sleep-
> No more; and by a sleep to say we end
> The heartache, and the thousand natural shocks
> That flesh is heir to. 'Tis a consummation

Devoutly to be wish'd. To die- to sleep.
To sleep -perchance to dream: ay, there's the rub!
For in that sleep of death what dreams may come
When we have shuffled off this mortal coil,
Must give us pause. There's the respect
That makes calamity of so long life.
For who would bear the whips and scorns of time,
Th' oppressor's wrong, the proud man's contumely,
The pangs of despis'd love, the law's delay,
The insolence of office, and the spurns
That patient merit of th' unworthy takes,
When he himself might his quietus make
With a bare bodkin? Who would these fardels bear,
To grunt and sweat under a weary life,
But that the dread of something after death-
The undiscover'd country, from whose bourn
No traveller returns- puzzles the will,
And makes us rather bear those ills we have
Than fly to others that we know not of?
Thus conscience does make cowards of us all,
And thus the native hue of resolution
Is sicklied o'er with the pale cast of thought,
And enterprises of great pith and moment
With this regard their currents turn awry
And lose the name of action.- Soft you now!
The fair Ophelia! - Nymph, in thy orisons
Be all my sins rememb'red. (Hamlet III.I.1710-1744)

Parodic parallels are abundant in Ros's text; however, they need to be looked at on a semantic level rather than a linguistic one. These parallels must be viewed as fragmented and undignified parallels of the prince's dignified and thoughtful soliloquy about life, death, after-death, and eternity.

Peter Egri, in his *Modern Games with Renaissance Forms*, proposes the following list of parallels which he points to as parodies: Hamlet's "To be" is referred to as "being alive in a box" by Ros in Stoppard's play; the disjunctive alternative "or" appears as "Would you rather be alive or dead?"; "not to be" becomes "one keeps forgetting to take into account the fact that one is dead"; "To die: to sleep" as "It would be just like being *asleep* in a box"; "To sleep: perchance to dream" appears as "Not that I'd like to sleep in a box, mind you, not without any air–you'd wake up dead"; "ay, there's the rub" is reiterated as

"That's the bit I don't like, frankly"; "must give us pause" becomes "you'd be helpless, wouldn't you?" and the pause that is created by the dots in Stoppard's play; "the whips and scorns of time" appears as Guil's warning to Ros when he bangs on the floor: "you don't have to flog it to death!"; "The undiscover'd country from whose bourn / No traveller returns" is read as "I mean you'd be in there for ever" and "Eternity is a terrible thought. I mean, where's it going to end?"; "The dread of something after death / … makes us rather bear those ills we have / than fly to others that we know not of" is repeated as "Life in a box is better than no life at all"; "the pale cast of thought" as "I wouldn't think about it, if I were you. You'd only get depressed" (Egri 60). Not only does Stoppard iterate Hamlet's thoughtful Elizabethan blank–verse soliloquy in Ros's contemporary-prose text but also he changes it to a comic monologue.

The playfulness of Ros's monologue becomes more obvious when its thematic difference from Hamlet's soliloquy is taken into consideration. Stoppard introduces the metaphor of box-world. The world of Shakespeare's Hamlet, with all its turmoil and troubles, is replaced with a box –coffin. According to Stoppard's reading of Hamlet's soliloquy, then, Shakespeare's Hamlet is to decide whether 'to be' alive in a dark box –his world- 'or' 'not to be' alive in it. Ros's monologue culminates in deciding that it is better to be alive even in a box. The same decision is reached by Hamlet in Shakespeare's drama; that, it is better to be alive, even if its troubles make it unbearable to live in it. Although Shakespeare's Hamlet expresses his reason for preferring to be alive –dread of the unknown and his Christian belief- Stoppard interprets –or 'distorts'- it by making Ros say his reason for preferring to be alive in a box -is "in a minute someone's going to bang on the lid and tell me to come out". Stoppard, thus, passes criticism on *Hamlet* by insinuating that Shakespeare's Hamlet does not commit suicide because he believes that there might be hope for solving his problems. The profound thought of the prince about life, death, and value of life in an unjust world gives its place to Ros's farcical speech about being alive or dead in a box. The metaphor of world\box and the

interpretations of what Hamlet says in the form of Ros's monologue display the playful intentions of the writer of *RAGAD*.

In Stoppard's play, Ros's speech precedes Hamlet's soliloquy, whose last lines are heard. One interpretation is that Stoppard insinuates that Hamlet forms his soliloquy based on what he hears from Ros. This interpretation diminishes the status of Hamlet even more and adds to the significance of a petty and insignificant character like Ros. The comic dimension of the play is enhanced based on this interpretation since the spectator/reader can not imagine that in Shakespeare's drama, Hamlet, the intelligent prince, has formed his soliloquy according to what he hears from Ros. Hamlet's soliloquy in Shakespeare's drama is to reveal the oscillatory intellectual mind of a prince who finds himself in a sea of troubles which is far stronger than his powers to manage; he thus questions life, death, after-death, and eternity. Hamlet's troubles, moreover, cannot be compared to trivial problems of Ros with his petty and marginal character in Shakespeare's play. Stoppard's play reverses the importance of Shakespeare's characters. In Stoppard's play Ros comes to the front and Hamlet is pushed to the background; the result is having Ros say Hamlet's soliloquy in his comic mid-twentieth century prose and later watching Hamlet comically 'weighing up the pros and cons of his quietus' –rather than soliloquy- and then only saying the last sentence of his soliloquy. The reversal of the significance of the characters, in addition to insinuating that Hamlet composes his soliloquy based on what Ros asserts, makes the whole parallel monologue –uttered by Ros- still funnier and renders it a parody of Hamlet's legendary soliloquy.

Explaining the reason why Stoppard has Ros parody Hamlet's soliloquy before Hamlet himself articulates it, Peter Egri puts forward a different interpretation:

> Order is also meaning: if Ros's prosaic pondering and blundering precede the parodistic fragment from Hamlet's soliloquy, they also prepare the spectator for the comic reinterpretation of the soliloquy. (Egri 60)

Egri's explication cannot be as authentic as the first interpretation already explicated because up to this point in Stoppard's play, lots of Hamlet's soliloquies and speeches are deleted and only a few parts are fragmentarily presented -parodied. Hamlet dramatized up to this point in Stoppard's play is a comic rather than tragic character and thus the spectator is almost already prepared for the comic reassessment of his soliloquy. Furthermore, if Ros's parodistic dialogue is to prepare the spectator for a comic reinterpretation of Hamlet's soliloquy why should it be a parodistic parallel at semantic level, which is onerous for the reader\spectator to follow, rather than a more perspicuous and easier-to-grasp lexical and verbal parody?

The Player, the omniscient character in Stoppard's play, is yet another character who off and on parodies Shakespeare's Hamlet. A good portion of His "dress rehearsal" is a brilliant parody of Hamlet:

> PLAYER: […] Lucianus, nephew to the king! (*Turns his attention to the* TRAGEDIANS) Next!
> *They disport themselves to accommodate the next piece of mime, which consists of the* PLAYER *himself exhibiting an excitable anguish* (*choreographed, stylized*) *leading to an impassioned scene with the* QUEEN (cf. *"the Closet Scene," Shakespeare Act III, scene iv*) *and a very stylized reconstruction of a* POLONIUS *figure being stabbed behind the arras* (*the murdered* KING *to stand in for* POLONIUS*) while the* PLAYER *himself continues his breathless commentary for the benefit of* ROS *and* GUIL.
> PLAYER: Lucianus, nephew to the king…usurped by his uncle and shattered by his mother's incestuous marriage…loses his reason…throwing the court into turmoil and disarray as he alternates between bitter melancholy and unrestricted lunacy…staggering from the suicidal (*a pose*) to the homicidal (*here he kills* "POLONIUS") …he at last confronts his mother and in a scene of provocative ambiguity–(*a somewhat oedipal embrace*) begs her to repent and recant ---(*he springs up, still talking*.) The King–(*he pushes forward the* POISONER/KING) tormented by guilt–haunted by fear–decides to dispatch his nephew to England–and entrusts this undertaking to two smiling accomplices–friends–courtiers–to two spies— (RAGAD 81)

In the mime show, the Player acts as Lucianus who is indeed Hamlet in Shakespeare's drama. The Player acts out Hamlet's anguished state leading to his closet scene, as Stoppard's stage directions point out. In Shakespeare's *Hamlet*, there is no such scene where the tragedians act out Lucianus and this is thoroughly innovated by Stoppard. The short mime show introduces a funny caricature of Hamlet and what he does in the 'closet scene' which indeed needs several pages for Shakespeare to dramatize. The turbulent mind of Hamlet, feigning madness, is presented by the 'excitable anguish' of the Player who acts it out in a 'choreographed and stylized' manner. The whole fervent 'closet scene' of Shakespeare's *Hamlet* with all its ardent dialogues is presented as a brief mime show where the Player, not Hamlet, plays as Lucianus/Hamlet. Stoppard's Player not only imitates Shakespeare's Hamlet but also pictures him minimally and funnily.

The Player here takes several roles simultaneously, and thus makes the scene more playful. The Player's commentary in the second part of the quoted lines cannot be considered as mere commentary on Lucianus. As a commentator, he not only comments on Lucianus but also comments on Hamlet and his actions and speeches. He establishes a parodistic reference to Hamlet's illustrious soliloquy –"to be or not to be"- when he comments on Lucianus/Hamlet: "[He] alternates between bitter melancholy and unrestricted lunacy…staggering from the suicidal […]". As a player, the Player is acting out Lucianus who actually represents Hamlet; he is then acting out Hamlet, as well. At the same time, he is keeping his own role as the Player; thus, as an omniscient commentator\narrator, he comments on Lucianus'/Hamlet's actions. The whole scene becomes funnier when Ros and Guil, stupefied and perplexed, are its spectators. The Player, thus, in the second part of the quoted lines imitates Hamlet while he has some other roles in the scene, as well; he pictures him not with Hamlet's own words and actions in Shakespeare's drama but with his caricaturist dumb actions and his few commentary sentences. The result is nothing but a hilarious representation of Shakespeare's Hamlet, a parody of him.

3.1.2 Plot

Describing his job as an actor, the Player in Stoppard's *RAGAD* asserts: "We do on stage the things that are supposed to happen off. Which is a kind of integrity, if you look on every exit being an entrance somewhere else" (28). What the Player says is indeed what Stoppard does with the plot of *Hamlet* in his *RAGAD*[1]. He dramatizes what occurs to Ros and Guil, two insignificant characters in *Hamlet*, from the time they are travelling to Elsinore -which is itself because of a royal summons- to the time they are executed and the report of their execution reaches the Danish court; however, the main portion of Stoppard's plot is about what happens to Ros and Guil when they are not present in the plot of *Hamlet*.

To make the connection between his plot and that of *Hamlet* more potent for the spectator/reader, Stoppard both re-presents some of the scenes of Shakespeare's plot and displays some scenes where Ros and Guil witness what happens in them. The other parts of Stoppard's plot are dedicated to what happens to Ros and Guil when they are not acting in the plot of *Hamlet* or witnessing it.

The main parody of the plot of *Hamlet* can be seen where Stoppard's plot overlaps Shakespeare's –i.e. where the plot of *Hamlet* is re-presented– and still more intensely where it touches Shakespeare's plot tangentially –i.e. Ros and Guil witness the plot of *Hamlet*.

Stoppard's plot overlaps the plot of *Hamlet* in eight scenes, in addition to touching it tangentially in seven scenes. Some of examples of these scenes can demonstrate how Stoppard imitates them and also treats them playfully. After being ordered by the king to find Hamlet and the dead body of Polonius, Ros and Guil exhibit a comic scene wherein they try to catch Hamlet by a trap they make using their belts. They, then, try to call him:

[1] The technique the Player states here is implemented by Stoppard both to create the plot of his play out of the plot of *Hamlet* and to portray some of the characters of his plot out of those of Shakespeare's; this is the reason why the Player's quotation is iterated in the Plot section, too.

ROS: Give him a shout.
GUIL: I thought we'd been into all that.
ROS: (*shouts*): Hamlet!
GUIL: Don't be absurd.
ROS: (*shouts*): Lord Hamlet!
HAMLET *enters.* ROS *is a little dismayed.*
What have you done, my Lord, with the dead body?
HAMLET: Compounded it with dust, whereto 'tis kin. […]

ROS: My Lord, you must tell us where the body is and go with us to the King.
HAMLET: The body is with the King, but the King is not with the body. The King is a thing---
GUIL: A thing, my Lord---?
HAMLET: Of nothing. Bring me to him.
HAMLET *moves resolutely towards one wing. They move with him, shepherding. Just before they reach the exit,* HAMLET*, apparently seeing* CLAUDIUS *approaching from offstage, bends low in a sweeping bow.* ROS *and* GUIL*, cued by Hamlet, also bow deeply–a sweeping ceremonial bow with their cloaks swept round them.* HAMLET*, however, continues the movement into an about–turn and walks off in the opposite direction.*
ROS *and* GUIL*, with their heads low, do not notice.*
No one comes on. ROS *and* GUIL *squint upwards and Find that they are bowing to nothing.*
CLAUDIUS *enters behind them. At first words they leap up and do a double-take.*
CLAUDIUS*:* How now? What hath befallen? (RAGAD 90 – 91)

Shakespeare's plot shows Ros and Guil both calling to Hamlet, too:

Elsinore. A passage in the Castle.
Enter Hamlet.
Hamlet: Safely stow'd.
Gentlemen: (Within) Hamlet! Lord Hamlet!
Hamlet: But soft! What noise? Who calls on Hamlet? O, here they come.
Enter Ros and Guil.
Rosencrantz: What have you done, my Lord, with the dead body?
Hamlet: Compounded it with dust, whereto 'tis kin. [...]
Rosencrantz: My lord, you must tell us where the body is and go with us to the King.
Hamlet: The body is with the King, but the King is not with the body. The King is a thing-
Guildenstern: A thing, my lord?

Hamlet: Of nothing. Bring me to him. Hide fox, and all after.
Exeunt.
Scene III.
Elsinore. A room in the Castle.
Enter King.
King: I have sent to seek him and to find the body.
How dangerous is it that this man goes loose!
Yet must not we put the strong law on him.
He's lov'd of the distracted multitude,
Who like not in their judgment, but their eyes;
And where 'tis so, th' offender's scourge is weigh'd,
But never the offence. To bear all smooth and even,
This sudden sending him away must seem
Deliberate pause. Diseases desperate grown
By desperate appliance are reliev'd,
Or not at all.
Enter Rosencrantz.
How now? O, what hath befall'n? (Hamlet IV.ii.2631-2673)

The verbal texts of the dialogues in both plays are closely similar; however, there are differences in Stoppard's imitation of this scene of Shakespeare's drama which make the effect of the whole scene substantially diverse and eventually funny.

In Stoppard's play the scene is preceded by the Beckettian act of Ros and Guil where they try to catch Hamlet by joining their belts while Ros's trousers slide down. In Shakespeare's drama, on the other hand, it is preceded by Hamlet's short monologue: "safely stow'd". In Stoppard's play the setting of place is the upstage with no further clue; in Shakespeare's drama the scene is supposed to take place in "a passage in the Castle". In Stoppard's play, it is only Ros who shouts "Hamlet" while in Shakespeare's drama both Gentlemen call to Hamlet. In Stoppard's play Hamlet responds to the call and goes to see Ros and Guil –enters the stage. In Shakespeare's *Hamlet*, Ros and Guil enter the passage in the castle where Hamlet has already been talking alone. Stoppard deletes the last words of Hamlet –"Hide fox and all after". In Stoppard's play instead of Claudius's monologue –where he reasons why he should not execute Hamlet and instead must send him away- there is a very funny mute action where Hamlet fools Ros and Guil and walks away. In Stoppard's play Claudius

enters the stage when Ros and Guil find out that Hamlet has fooled them. In Shakespeare's drama, on the contrary, Ros goes to Claudius and it happens while Guil, Hamlet, and attendants are waiting outside to be called in.

As a result of the changes that Stoppard makes in this scene of *Hamlet*, including re-contextualizing it, the significance of Hamlet and Claudius, as the protagonist and antagonist of Shakespeare's drama, is diminished and instead Ros and Guil are given prominence. Although the plot of the aforementioned scene in Stoppard's play is more or less a copy of the same scene in *Hamlet* – Hamlet is called and he responds, then Ros and Guil take him to the king and the king asks them about Hamlet- its effect is diametrically divergent. By adding the part that Ros and Guil are fooled by Hamlet, Stoppard creates a funny spectacle instead of a serious scene. By making Claudius go to see Ros and Guil, who are surprised and instantly make a double-take before him, and by omitting Claudius's monologue the serious scene of *Hamlet* is turned to a funny spectacle for the spectators. Stoppard imitates this part of *Hamlet*; nonetheless, by the changes he introduces to it, he proffers a playful treatment of it. This is how Stoppard parodies some parts of the plot of *Hamlet*.

There are seven scenes where the plot of *RAGAD* touches the plot of *Hamlet* tangentially. In these scenes Ros and Guil are positioned downstage while a part of the plot of *Hamlet* is acted out upstage. An instance can be seen at the end of the first act of *RAGAD*. Before greeting Hamlet, Ros and Guil watch and hear a part of the conversation between Hamlet and Polonius:

> HAMLET *enters, backwards, talking, followed by* POLONIOUS, *upstage.* ROS *and* GUIL *occupy the two downstage corners looking upstage.*
> HAMLET: …for you yourself, sir, should be as old as I am if like a crab you could go backward.
> POLONIUS (*aside*): Though this be madness, yet there is method in it. Will you walk out of the air, my lord?
> HAMLET: Into my grave.
> POLONIUS: Indeed, that's out of the air.
> HAMLET *crosses to upstage exit.* POLONIUS *asiding unintelligibly until*----
> My lord, I will take my leave of you.

> HAMLET: You can not take from me anything that I will more willingly part withal---except my life, except my life, except my life….
> POLONIUS: (*crossing downstage*): Fare you well, my lord.
> (*To* ROS:)
> You go to seek lord Hamlet? There he is.
> ROS (*To* POLONIUS): God save you sir.
> POLONIUS *goes*.
> GUIL: (*calls upstage to* HAMLET): My honoured Lord!
> (RAGAD 52-53)

The same scene in Shakespeare's drama does not show Ros and Guil witnessing the conversation between Hamlet and Polonius:

> Hamlet: […] for you yourself, sir,
> should be old as I am if, like a crab, you could go backward.
> Polonius: [*aside*] Though this be madness, yet there is a method in't.-
> Will you walk out of the air, my lord?
> Hamlet: Into my grave?
> Polonius: Indeed, that is out o' th' air. [*Aside*] How pregnant sometimes his replies are! a happiness that often madness hits on, which reason and sanity could not so prosperously be delivered of. I will leave him and suddenly contrive the means of meeting between him and my daughter - My honourable lord, I will most humbly take my leave of you.
> Hamlet: You cannot, sir, take from me anything that I will more willingly part withal- except my life, except my life, except my life,
> *Enter Rosencrantz and Guildenstern.*
> Polonius: Fare you well, my lord.
> Hamlet: These tedious old fools!
> Polonius: You go to seek the lord Hamlet. There he is.
> Rosencrantz: [*to Polonius*] God save you, sir!
> *Exit Polonius.*
> Guildenstern: My honour'd lord!
> Rosencrantz: My most dear lord! (Hamlet II.ii.1241-1266)

In *Hamlet*, Ros and Guil enter when Polonius wants to leave and thus they only hear the last two sentences of the conversation between Hamlet and Polonius. Stoppard, however, lets his Ros and Guil hear more than the last sentences from the conversation between Hamlet and Polonius. In Shakespeare's tragedy, Hamlet and Polonius are already on the stage when Ros and Guil enter;

however, in Stoppard's play Ros and Guil are already on the stage while Hamlet and Polonius enter. In Stoppard's play Hamlet enters backwards, as if trying to escape his conversation with Polonius –at the same time, it can be a parody of his later sentence to Polonius: "if like a crab you could go backward".

Stoppard's version of this scene of *Hamlet* omits some parts of the dialogues and distorts Shakespeare's text by having Ros and Guil watch the conversation between Hamlet and Polonius. Ros and Guil seem not to be playing in *Hamlet* but watching it; although, the spectators know that they are part of the same play they just watch. Stoppard's main strategy in the aforementioned scene is to have his course of the plot run on the downstage and let Shakespeare's plot be performed on the upstage till the time that both of the plots overlap each other. In other words, Stoppard makes Shakespeare's plot back-grounded while making his own plot fore-grounded. By so doing, Stoppard creates another kind of parody of the plot of *Hamlet*. The plot of *Hamlet* is introduced to the audience not as it is but as observed by Ros and Guil while stupefied and frozen on the stage they watch it. The plot of *RAGAD*, here touches a distorted part of the plot of *Hamlet* and altogether yields a playful treatment of the plot of *Hamlet* two minor characters of which are separated to watch a part of it and at the same time play in it.

In the aforementioned scene, not only are Ros and Guil the protagonists of Stoppard's play but also they are a narrow window through which the audience can watch the plot of *Hamlet*. Stoppard, thus, shifts the point of view of the plot of *Hamlet* to the limited stupefied point of view of Ros and Guil[1].

The largest portion of the plot of *RAGAD* is dedicated to what happens to Ros and Guil when they are not interacting or watching the plot of *Hamlet*. This large portion can itself be divided into two other smaller parts. Stoppard constructs some of this portion of the plot of *RAGAD* based on the information

[1] Although the objective point of view is the common point of view in almost every play, it cannot be exclusive nor can it be scientifically pure; there are often some tendencies to other kinds of point of views. The tendency of Stoppard's point of view in his plot is towards his protagonists, towards how Ros and Guil see the events happening in the plot of *Hamlet* both when they are interacting in it and when they witness it.

asserted by the characters in *Hamlet* –like changing Ophelia's speech to dramatic action (34, 35) or Hamlet's dialogue about the pirates, the sea fight, and his changing of letters which leads to the execution of Ros and Guil to a whole act in his play, the third act (97–126). The remaining portion of the plot is what Stoppard genuinely creates himself -like what happens to Ros and Guil on the road to Elsinore including the improbable run of the heads in the game of coin tossing between Ros and Guil (11-35).

The less vivid parody of the plot of *Hamlet* –compared to the parodied parts of it when Ros and Guil interact in it and when they witness it- can be traced where Stoppard transforms the information provided by the characters of *Hamlet* to dramatic scenes. Although Stoppard's playful creativity is still at full bloom in creating the dialogues and actions for these scenes, their ideas are originally provided by Shakespeare. For instance, addressing Horatio in his letter, Shakespeare's Hamlet notes:

> Horatio: (*reads the letter*) 'Horatio, when thou shalt have overlook'd this, give these fellows some means to the King. They have letters for him. Ere we were two days old at sea, a pirate of very warlike appointment gave us chase. Finding ourselves too slow of sail, we put on a compelled valour, and in the grapple I boarded them. (IV.vi.2986-2991)

Later, explaining what happened on the ship, Hamlet refers to the sea-fight again: "Now, the next day \ Was our sea-fight" (Hamlet V.ii.3556-7). Stoppard playfully dramatized Hamlet's account:

> ROS: Incidents! All we get is incidents! Dear God, is it too much to expect a little sustained action?!
> *And on the word, the* PIRATES *attack. That is to say: Noise and shouts and rushing about*. "Pirates."
> *Everyone visible goes frantic.* HAMLET *draws his sword and rushes downstage.* GUIL, ROS *and* PLAYER *draw swords and rush upstage. Collision.* HAMLET *turns back up. They turn back down. Collision. By which time there is general panic right upstage. All four charge upstage with* ROS, GUIL *and* PLAYER *shouting:*
> At last!
> To arms!
> Pirates!

Up there!
Down there!
To my sword's length!
Action!
All four reach the top, see something they don't like, waver, run for their lives downstage. (RAGAD 118)

Stoppard, thus, dramatizes what Shakespeare's *Hamlet* only talks about. In Shakespeare's drama, the sea-fight is referred to as a past event while Stoppard dramatizes it as a present action. Shakespeare's Hamlet uses friendly Elizabethan prose and later blank verse to give an account of the event; Stoppard, on the other hand, uses a mid twentieth-century prose to demonstrate the frantic state of his characters, although for Rosencrantz the event may seem as his wish comes true[1]. In *Hamlet*, the scene is narrated by applying a first person point of view –Hamlet's point of view- which implies that the stress is on how Hamlet observes and interprets the event. In Stoppard's play the scene is dramatized through a third person objective point of view, the tendency of which is towards Rosencrantz's perspective. There is a ship chase by the pirates before they capture the ship in Shakespeare's drama. In Stoppard's play the pirates all of a sudden break in without any ship chase. In *Hamlet*, there is no account of the players nor is there a character named the Player. The event in *Hamlet* is interpreted as a part of a tragedy. In Stoppard's play, however, the pirate scene is turned to a comedy which is a part of a larger one.

The funny scene is initiated by Ros who asks for "a little sustained action" and suddenly the pirates break in. The 'collision' of characters –Hamlet being one of them- who can not handle the situation, is yet another source of the funny spectacle that Stoppard portrays. Not only does Stoppard create a part

[1] Since Ros wishes for a sustained action just before the pirates attack, he feels satisfied to have it. Stoppard does not indicate who shouts what in this scene; however, a likely sequence can be the sequence he provides in his stage direction just before the characters shout: "…*with* ROS, GUIL *and* PLAYER *shouting*". Ros, thus, shouts first. His words, then, can be: At last! … Up there! … Action! Rosencrantz enjoys the event as Stoppard insinuates. This interpretation, which seems the most feasible one, makes the scene more playful and entertaining. When Ros's action, just after these words, –leaping into a barrel because of being scared- is seen, the discrepancy between what he asks for and says, on the one hand, and what he does, on the other, creates a comic scene.

of his plot according to what is narrated in *Hamlet* but also he modifies it to suit his entertaining and comic purposes; after all, as he says himself, his purpose of writing *RAGAD* is "to entertain a roomful of people" (Ambushes 6).

The plot of *RAGAD*, generally speaking, can be divided into four categories. The first category embraces those parts that overlap the plot of Shakespeare's *Hamlet*. The second one is when it touches the plot of *Hamlet* tangentially and the third one can be traced when it is based on the information that the characters of *Hamlet* provide. The last but not the least significant portion of the plot of *RAGAD* encompasses those parts that Stoppard creates genuinely. The first three portions of the plot of Stoppard's play not only repeat some parts of the plot of *Hamlet* with modifications but also sketch them playfully; i.e. they parody the plot of *Hamlet*.

3.1.3 Themes

In his *RAGAD,* Stoppard reiterates some of the themes of *Hamlet*; however, he treats some of them playfully. The themes of *Hamlet* that are treated playfully by Stoppard in his *RAGAD* are 'fate and destiny' and 'death, its mysterious nature, and the uncertainty of what will happen after it'.

The theme of 'fate and destiny' is one of the central themes in both *Hamlet* and *RAGAD*. Shakespeare depicts Hamlet as a dynamic character who despises and questions his destiny at the beginning of the play: "The time is out of joint. O cursed spite \ That ever I was born to set it right!" (I.iv.885-6). As the play progresses, Hamlet comes to terms with his destiny and accepts it as it is. He realizes that there is no escape from his fate and even finds a sense of justice in it: "that should learn us \ There's a divinity that shapes our ends, \ Rough-hew them how we will-"(V.ii.3508-10). And towards the end:

…we defy augury; there's a special providence

> in the fall of a sparrow. If it be now, 'tis not to come; if it be not to come, it will be now; if it be not now, yet it will come: the readiness is all. (V.ii.3668-3671)

Shakespeare, as an Elizabethan, confirms the existence of a sense of justice in fate. He dramatizes the necessity to accept one's fate through portraying his protagonist as a thoughtful 'prince' consenting to and embracing his fate at the end of the play.

Stoppard, as a twentieth-century playwright, playfully imitates *Hamlet*'s theme of fate in his *RAGAD*. Stoppard's play delineates the theme of fate from two perspectives. The first one is the real world of Ros and Guil, as they consider it themselves. The other is the unreal theatrical world of Ros and Guil, as the audience looks at it. Based on the first perspective, Ros and Guil, as real characters not as predestined characters in Shakespeare's plot, do not apprehend what is actually happening around them. They try to understand their roles in their lives at the beginning of the play. The play progresses and they do not take real active roles in running the course of their lives and in controlling it. Out of their unmitigated confusion and bewilderment, Ros and Guil do not thoroughly fathom the ultimate reality of their conditions and thus do not know how to act:

> GUIL: But for God's sake what are we supposed to do?
> PLAYER: Relax. Respond. That's what people do. You can't go through life questioning your situation at every turn.
> GUIL: But we don't know what's going on, or what to do with ourselves. We don't know how to *act*. (RAGAD 66)

Even if Ros and Guil want to act, they cannot, because of their partial -if not utter lack of- understanding of an unalterable higher power, their fate. Guil notices their confining fate:

> Free to move, speak, extemporize, and yet. We have not been cut loose. Our truancy is defined by one fixed star, and our drift represents merely a slight change of angle to it: we may seize the moment, toss it around while the moments pass, a short dash here, an exploration there, but we are brought round full circle to face again the single immutable fact… (RAGAD 101)

Ros and Guil, as two common men who question their unfathomable fate at the beginning of the play, stop questioning it at the end of it and embrace their fate without appreciating it:

> GUIL (*broken*): we've travelled too far, and our momentum has taken over; we move idly towards eternity, without possibility of reprieve or hope of explanation.
> ROS: Be happy—if you're not even *happy* what's so good about surviving? (*He picks himself up*.) We'll be all right. I suppose we just go on. (121)

And a bit later, accepting his destiny, Guil disappears while he says: "Well, we'll know better next time. Now you see me, now you –(*and disappears*)" (126). Since Ros and Guil are two Elizabethans who speak mid-twentieth century prose most of the time, in a way, their fate can be a hilarious reverberation of the fate of the common European post-world-war people who met their destinies while they were not able to comprehend it thoroughly. Stoppard imitates Shakespeare's theme of fate by applying it to two common and petty characters, implying that the fate of common people is decided by an unchanging higher power that is beyond the boundaries of their perception. Ros and Guil have no way but to face their fate. They go to their destinies not as Shakespeare's Hamlet, a challenging and strong prince who wants "to take arms against a sea of troubles", but as two impotent and weak characters, 'two sponges'. The application of the lofty theme of Shakespeare's tragedy to a farce and the petty and playful characters in it, is in a way an incongruous application and imitation; an incongruity which is itself a source of the comic dimension of the play. Since there is yet another angle to interpret the lives of Ros and Guil, and scrutinize the theme of *RAGAD*, the dual themes of the play, in regard to fate and destiny, render both of them less serious and still more playful.

Viewed from another perspective, Ros and Guil in Stoppard's play are two predestined characters of *Hamlet*; their destiny is inevitable and they are 'dead' right from the title of the play. At the beginning of the play, Ros and Guil tend to explore the extent to which they have independence to choose

whether to accept the task assigned to them by Claudius or not; by so doing, they, in fact, unknowingly examine their freedom to alter the roles allotted to them by the Shakespearean plot.

Ros and Guil inspect their freedom. They start to inquire about their fate, thinking that they might have control over their own destiny. Guil asserts "if we happened, just happened to discover, or even suspect that our spontaneity was part of their order, we'd know that we were lost" (60). Guil believes, then, that their spontaneity is not a part of their controlling fate and they can depend on it to change it. The reaction to this suspicion is Ros's crying "fire" to show he can act beyond his controlling destiny –which is itself a funny understanding of fate and destiny. At the end of the play, however, the two parodied characters of *Hamlet* find out that whatever their fate is, there is no escape from it; thus, Guil says: "[…] we move idly towards eternity, without possibility of reprieve or hope of explanation" (121). The world of Ros and Guil is presented to the audience of Stoppard's play as the real world but it is simply and indeed the world of another play, *Hamlet*. The original playwright, Shakespeare, is the controller of their fate and there is no understanding of that fate for the characters themselves or even freedom to choose. The Player ironically refers to this fate:

> PLAYER: […] There's a design at work in all art–surely you know that? Events must play themselves out to aesthetic, moral and logical conclusion.
> GUIL: And what's that, in this case?
> PLAYER: It never varies–we aim at the point where everyone who is marked for death dies. […]
> GUIL: Who decides?
> PLAYER (*switching off his smile*): Decides? It is *written*.
> (79-80)

In other words, Stoppard wants his audience to observe the fate of Ros and Guil as the fate of characters in a fictional work, as well. The literary determinism that constructs the fate of unknowing choiceless fictional characters is, thus, the other interpretation of the theme of 'fate and destiny' in Stoppard's play –and,

of course, the other aspect of the parody of *Hamlet*'s theme of 'fate and destiny' in Stoppard's play.

The two operating levels of the theme of fate in Stoppard's play are so intermingled that entirely separating one from the other seems difficult, if not impossible; this is another playful aspect which adds to the playful perspective through which the theme of fate, dramatized in *Hamlet*, is viewed in *RAGAD*.

Closely related to the theme of fate is the theme of death which Stoppard's *RAGAD* playfully imitates from Shakespeare's *Hamlet*. As a tragedy, *Hamlet* underlines the mysterious nature of death and its inevitability. Stoppard parodies this theme and looks at it as the death/disappearance of characters of a previously-written play.

After his father's murder, Shakespeare's Hamlet is obsessed with the idea of death. Over the course of the play, he considers death from a great many perspectives. He meditates on both the spiritual aftermath of death, embodied in the ghost scene and implied in his soliloquy "to be, or not to be" (III.I.1710-44), and the physical remainders of the dead, such as the time he holds Yorick's skull and ponders about the decaying corpses:

> Hamlet: Let me see. [*Takes the skull*.] Alas, poor Yorick! I knew him, Horatio. A fellow of infinite jest, of most excellent fancy. He hath borne me on his back a thousand times. And now how abhorred in my imagination it is! My gorge rises at it. Here hung those lips that I have kiss'd I know not how oft. Where be your gibes now? Your gambols? Your songs? Your flashes of merriment that were wont to set the table on a roar? Not one now, to mock your own grinning? Quite chap- fall'n? […]
> Hamlet: Dost thou think Alexander look'd o' this fashion i' th' earth?
> Horatio: E'en so.
> Hamlet: And smelt so? Pah!
> [*Puts down the skull.]*
> Horatio: E'en so, my lord.
> Hamlet: To what base uses we may return. (V.i.3369-90)

Throughout, the idea of death is closely connected to the themes of truth and uncertainty, both the uncertainty of the world, intentions, and ideas and the

uncertainty about what will happen after death. Since death is both the cause and consequence of revenge in the play, it is intimately tied to the theme of revenge and justice, which are the other major themes in Hamlet –Claudius's murder of King Hamlet initiates Hamlet's quest for revenge and Claudius's death is the end of that quest, however, it costs the avenger's life and the lives of some other characters. The question of his own death plagues Hamlet, as well -he repeatedly contemplates whether suicide is a morally legitimate action in face of an unbearably painful world (III.I.1710-44). Hamlet's grief and misery is so great that he frequently longs for death to end his suffering but he fears that if he commits suicide, he will be consigned to eternal damnation in hell because of Christianity's prohibition of suicide. The uncertainty of what happens after death is another line of thought that prevents Hamlet from committing suicide. In his "to be, or not to be" soliloquy, he displays this uncertainty, too. The uncertainty of what happens after death adds to the mysterious nature of death displayed in the play.

More or less the same kind of preoccupation with death is reiterated in Stoppard's *RAGAD*, however, in a different and playful manner. The lofty cause of revenge, the philosophical thoughts about death and revenge, and at large the thought-provoking dimensions of death are all lost in Stoppard's play.

Ros and Guil brood on the idea of death. Ros tries to explain the nature of death and its mystery by likening death to being alive in a box (RAGAD 70-71). The mystery of death for Ros is just the physical dead body that is in a box, lying dead! Unlike the Christian view in *Hamlet*, there is no reference to the spirit and a world after death. How different from Shakespeare's Hamlet's is Ros's reflection about death.

For Guil, too, the mystery of death is not complicated: "Death is …not. Death isn't… Death is the ultimate negative. Not-being." (RAGAD 108). Death for him is just disappearance:

> It's [-death is-] just a man failing to reappear, that's all–now you see him, now you don't, that's the only thing that's real: here one minute and gone the next and never coming back–an exit,

> unobtrusive and unannounced, a disappearance gathering weight as it goes on, until, finally, it is heavy with death. (RAGAD 84)

Guil, like Ros, is preoccupied with the physical body of the dead, however, observed differently. For the ones who are alive, the body of the one who is dead is in the grave, not amongst the living. It has thus disappeared from the world of the living. Guil's understanding of death can also point to the physical disappearance of an actor who acts out dying on the stage and then disappears from the eyes of the spectators. Guil does not even take into account what happens to the dead body; he only looks at it from the view point of the people who are alive. The mystery of death, thus, is not so much complicated from the limited playful view point of Ros and Guil.

The Player is the other character who talks about death. Talking with Ros and Guil, he looks at death only from its theatrical point of view. He is the leading actor of the band of 'the tragedians' and what is important for him is not the reality of death but its being convincing for the spectators (RAGAD 83-4). The Player is an actor and death for him is nothing but acting out dying on the stage and it must be done in a way that spectators like to watch it and believe it.

Whatever Ros, Guil, and the Player say about death, its meaning, and its mystery demonstrates their superficial and shallow understandings of death. Stoppard, hence, modifies the theme of 'the mystery of death and after death' that appears in Hamlet. In Stoppard's play death is perceived as the death of the characters of a play as predestined by a playwright and how the dead feel lying in a box. The philosophical observations about death, its consequences, and the uncertainty about what happens after it, which can be inferred from Shakespeare's drama, are all replaced with a shallow and playful understanding of death in Stoppard's play. Hamlet's theme of death is, thus, parodied by Stoppard in his farcical unhappy-ending RAGAD.

3.2 Parody of Beckett's *Waiting for Godot*

3.2.1 Characters

Although in his *Tom Stoppard, An Assessment*, Tim Brassell denies parodic connections between *RAGAD* and *Waiting for Godot*, he suggests, affirming Jim Hunter, that the echoes of *Waiting for Godot* appearing in it are in a spirit of celebration (61-62). If the element of playfulness, in Stoppard's treatment of *Waiting for Godot* in his play, endorsed by Brassell, is added to the 'celebratory echoes' which Hunter and Brassell point out, the result will be opposite to what Brassell and Hunter believe; i.e. the echoes of *Waiting for Godot* in Stoppard's *RAGAD* are parodic[1].

It should be observed, however, that not all the echoes of *Waiting for Godot* in *RAGAD* are treated playfully; nor are all these echoes imitations of *Waiting for Godot* with difference – i.e. some simply create the mood of *Waiting for Godot* by appropriating a few elements of it without intentionally addressing any particular scene or element of it. Moreover, compared to the systematic and crystal-clear parodies of *Hamlet* in *RAGAD*, the parodies of *Waiting for Godot* appearing in Stoppard's play are far less ordered and palpable.

The parodic imitations of *Waiting for Godot* in *RAGAD* can be traced mostly in the characterizations of Ros and Guil. The dialogues, actions, and character traits of Ros and Guil sometimes appear to be playful imitations of the characters of Beckett's *Waiting for Godot*.

In his *RAGAD*, Stoppard sometimes parodies Beckett's *Waiting for Godot* on a verbal level. These verbal parodies can be detected in some of the dialogues of Ros and Guil as well as in their verbal games. In Stoppard's play

[1] Unlike Hunter and Brassell, there are some other critics who believe in the parodic nature of Beckettian adaptations and imitations in *RAGAD*. Peter Egri, for instance, emphasizes this outlook at large when he says "*RAGAD* can be read as a parody both of *Hamlet* and *Godot*" (76). Some other critics, like Brustein, imply the parodic nature of Stoppard's adaptations of Beckett by calling *RAGAD* "a form of Beckett without tears" (Brustein 26).

when Ros asks Guil "what are you playing at?" Guil replies: "Words, words" (41). Not only does Guil's reply bring to mind Hamlet's well-known reply to Polonius but also it recalls Vladimir's anxious reply to the boy messenger in the first act of Waiting for Godot; Vladimir exclaims: "Words, words" (18). Elsewhere Guil tries to explain the unlikely run of heads in their coin-tossing game. He proposes a few tentative explanations, among which one is: "I'm willing it. Inside where nothing shows, I am the essence of a man spinning double-headed coins, and betting against himself in private atonement for an unremembered past" (16). In a similar vein Vladimir in *Waiting for Godot* suggests: "Suppose we repented" (2). In a second attempt to explain the improbable run of heads, Guil proposes: "Two, time has stopped dead" (16). Guil's suggestion echoes Vladimir's anguished remark: "Time has stopped" (12). Still another example is the sense of uncertainty that Stoppard's protagonists feel and is voiced by Guil: "the sense of isolation and uncertainty … all this induces a loosening of the concentration" (107). The Player assures Guil who is upset because of the uncertainty he feels by asserting: "Uncertainty is the normal state"(66). In the same way in Beckett's play, Estragon assures Vladimir, who is getting worried about the uncertainty of their situation, of the uncertainty of everything: "[…] nothing is certain" (19).

In all the aforementioned instances, Stoppard not only creates dialogues which are similar to those of *Waiting for Godot* but also he appropriates them for his less tragic and far less gloomy play, compared to *Waiting for Godot.* Stoppard's characters, unlike Beckett's, are 'well-dressed gentlemen' of an identifiable past, not outcasts in an unidentifiable world. The characters of Stoppard, as he admits, are created "to entertain a roomful of people" (Ambushes 6). The situations in which the aforementioned dialogues take place become more playful when the audience recognize Ros and Guil as the minor dispensable characters of *Hamlet*, who find everything baffling in their world and lack the power to recognize themselves as the characters of another play destined by its playwright to die in that play and thus they must die in their new play, too.

The verbal games that appear in *RAGAD* are also reminiscent of the games that Vladimir and Estragon play in Beckett's *Waiting for Godot.* In the second act of Beckett's play, Vladimir and Estragon try to imitate Pozzo and Lucky:

> VLADIMIR: We could play at Pozzo and Lucky.
> ESTRAGON: Never heard of it.
> VLADIMIR: I'll do Lucky, you do Pozzo. (*He imitates Lucky sagging under the weight of his baggage. Estragon looks at him with stupefaction.*) Go on.
> ESTRAGON: What am I to do?
> VLADIMIR: Curse me!
> ESTRAGON: (*after reflection*). Naughty!
> VLADIMIR: Stronger!
> ESTRAGON: Gonococcus! Spirochete!
> *Vladimir sways back and forth, doubled in two.*
> VLADIMIR: Tell me to think.
> ESTRAGON: What?
> VLADIMIR: Say, Think, pig!
> ESTRAGON: Think, pig!
> *Silence.*
> VLADIMIR: I can't.
> ESTRAGON: That's enough of that.
> VLADIMIR: Tell me to dance.
> ESTRAGON: I'm going.
> VLADIMIR: Dance, hog! (*He writhes. Exit Estragon left, precipitately.*) I can't! (*He looks up, misses Estragon.*) Gogo! (*He moves wildly about the stage. Enter Estragon left, panting. He hastens towards Vladimir, falls into his arms.*) There you are again at last!
> ESTRAGON: I'm accursed! (26)

Vladimir who is more intelligent than his partner explains to Estragon how to play the role of Pozzo but Estragon does not seem to comprehend the game. In the same vein Ros and Guil attempt to play the roles of Hamlet and themselves in Stoppard's play:

> GUIL: … Glean what afflicts him.
> ROS: Me?
> GUIL: Him.
> ROS: How?
> GUIL: Question and answer. Old ways are the best ways.

ROS: He's afflicted.
GUIL: You question, I'll answer.
ROS: He's not himself, you know.
GUIL: I'm him, you see.
Beat.
ROS: Who am I then?
GUIL: You're yourself.
ROS: And he's you?
GUIL: Not a bit of it. […..]
ROS: How should I begin?
GUIL: Address me.
ROS: My dear Guildenstern!
GUIL (*quietly*): You've forgotten-haven't you!
ROS: My dear Rosencrantz!
GUIL (*great control*): I don't think you quite understand. What we are attempting is a hypothesis in which *I* answer for *him*, while *you* ask me questions. (46-47)

Being more intelligent than his partner, Guil does what Vladimir does. He explains the game which is based on a shared experience they both have had together –meeting and questioning Hamlet- but his partner, like Estragon, does not understand the game and is simply confused. In Beckett's play, Estragon is exhausted and escapes from playing the game; when he returns, he is scared and remarks: "I'm accursed, ….. I'm in hell" (26). In Stoppard's play, on the contrary, after not understanding the game, Ros mistakenly supposes that the game is the 'questions game':

GUIL: You know what to do?
ROS: What?
GUIL: Are you stupid?
ROS: Pardon!
GUIL: Are you deaf?
ROS: Did you speak?
GUIL (*admonishing*): Not now---
ROS: Statement.
GUIL (*shouts*): Not now! …. (47-48)

The situation becomes still funnier when Ros understands the game at last and plays it. In other words, the gloomy situation created by Beckett's play is turned to a funny verbal game in Stoppard's play. Although in the aforementioned

dialogues Beckett's words and sentences are not iterated in Stoppard's play, the same technique is used, however, to yield funny dialogues and situations ultimately.

The other verbal technique of Beckett's *Waiting for Godot* which is parodied in *RAGAD* is its stichomythia[1] and cross-talk. The following example is only one among many instances of the Beckettian cross-talks in Stoppard's play. After the first meeting between the players and Hamlet, Ros and Guil address the Player:

> GUIL: Now mind your tongue, or we'll have it out and throw the rest of you away, like a nightingale at a Roman feast.
> ROS: Took the very words out of my mouth.
> GUIL: You'd be *lost* for words.
> ROS: You'd be tongue-tied.
> GUIL: Like a mute in a monologue.
> ROS: Like a nightingale at a Roman feast.
> GUIL: Your diction will go to pieces.
> ROS: Your lines will be cut.
> GUIL: To dumbshows.
> ROS: And dramatic pauses.
> GUIL: You'll never *find* your tongue.
> ROS: Lick your lips.
> GUIL: Taste your tears.
> ROS: Your breakfast.
> GUIL: You won't know the difference.
> ROS: There won't be any.
> GUIL: We'll take the very words out of your mouth.
> ROS: So you've caught on.
> GUIL: So you've caught up. (62-63)

Beckett exhibits the same technique when he makes his Vladimir and Estragon talk in order to pass the time:

> ESTRAGON: It's so we won't think.
> VLADIMIR: We have that excuse.
> ESTRAGON: It's so we won't hear.
> VLADIMIR: We have our reasons.

[1] An ancient Greek arrangement of dialogue in drama, poetry, and disputation in which single lines of verse or parts of lines are spoken by alternate speakers. In his *Waiting for Godot*, Beckett displays this kind of arrangement and engineers it in a way to yield the absurdist impacts he seeks. Stoppard's employment of stichomythia is more akin to Beckett's application of it than that of ancient Greeks.

ESTRAGON: All the dead voices.
VLADIMIR: They make a noise like wings.
ESTRAGON: Like leaves.
VLADIMIR: Like sand.
ESTRAGON: Like leaves.
Silence.
VLADIMIR: They all speak at once.
ESTRAGON: Each one to itself.
Silence.
VLADIMIR: Rather they whisper.
ESTRAGON: They rustle.
VLADIMIR: They murmur.
ESTRAGON: They rustle.
Silence. (21)

The pattern which can be detected is that first the more intelligent character –Guil\Vladimir- starts a line of thought in the form of a short sentence then the less intelligent partner –Ros\Estragon- supports it with a syntactically similar short sentence which has only a word or two different. Then, when the less intelligent partner falls short of thinking\words, he repeats his partner's previously asserted sentence\words.

The difference between Beckett's usage of this technique and Stoppard's application of it does not lie only in different words\meanings. The goals of Stoppard are also divergent from those of Beckett. Beckett uses these cross-talks in order to show the absurdity of them and the absurdity of the situation of his characters, the incapability of language to be a means of communication, and to let his characters pass the time. On the other hand, Stoppard's characters in the aforementioned dialogue try to threaten the Player in order to show that they are important and have 'influence' in the court of Denmark. The irony is that the Player seems to have more influence in court and that the audience knows it well that Ros and Guil are two insignificant characters of another play who try to boast and brag in this play when they are confronted with somebody whom, they think, is less important than they are. The whole situation for the spectator becomes a funny one and renders it a parody of Beckett's similar technique.

3.2.2 Actions and Speeches

From the view point of what the characters do, Stoppard's *RAGAD* has some similarities with Beckett's *Waiting for Godot* –the similarities which are treated playfully in Stoppard's play, compared to the gloomy atmosphere of Beckett's. One of the outstanding instances of this kind of imitation in Stoppard's play is the trousers' joke. When Ros and Guil try to trap Hamlet by joining their belts, Hamlet easily evades them and leaves them behind stupefied. Ros finds his trousers down and pulls them up:

> GUIL: You stand there! Don't let him pass!
> *He positions* ROS *with his back to one wing, facing* HAMLET's *entrance.* GUIL *positions himself next to* ROS *a few feet away, so that they are covering one side of the stage, facing the opposite side.* GUIL *unfastens his belt.* ROS *does the same. They join the two belts, and hold them taut between them.* ROS*'s trousers slide slowly down. Hamlet enters opposite slowly, dragging* POLONIUS*'s body. He enters upstage, makes a small arc and leaves by the same side, a few feet downstage.* ROS *and* GUIL*, holding the belt taut, stare at him in some bewilderment.* HAMLET *leaves, dragging the body. They relax the strain on the belts.*
> ROS: That was close.
> GUIL: There's a limit to what two people can do.
> *They undo the belts:* ROS *pulls up his trousers*. (89)

A similar incident happens in *Waiting for Godot* for Estragon –who, like Ros, is the less intelligent of the duo. Toward the end of the play, Vladimir and Estragon try to hang themselves because of the absurdity of their lives and out of despair:

> ESTRAGON: Why don't we hang ourselves?
> VLADIMIR: With what?
> ESTRAGON: You haven't got a bit of rope?
> VLADIMIR: No.
> ESTRAGON: Then we can't.
> *Silence.*
> VLADIMIR: Let's go.

ESTRAGON: Wait, there's my belt.
VLADIMIR: It's too short.
ESTRAGON: You could hang onto my legs.
VLADIMIR: And who'd hang onto mine?
ESTRAGON: True.
VLADIMIR: Show me all the same. (*Estragon loosens the cord that holds up his trousers which, much too big for him, fall about his ankles. They look at the cord.*) It might do in a pinch. But is it strong enough? ….
ESTRAGON: I can't go on like this.
VLADIMIR: That's what you think.
ESTRAGON: If we parted? That might be better for us.
VLADIMIR: We'll hang ourselves tomorrow. (*Pause.*) Unless Godot comes. ….
ESTRAGON: Well? Shall we go?
VLADIMIR: Pull on your trousers. …..
ESTRAGON: (*realizing his trousers are down*). True. *He pulls up his trousers.* (35-36)

Dramatizing the falling trousers' joke, both of the plays exhibit a funny spectacle; however, their difference is striking. Beckett creates a dismal situation in which two tramps want to escape from life by hanging themselves and they understand that they are even incapable of doing so. Stoppard's 'well-dressed' characters, on the other hand, try to trap Hamlet who seems much smarter than they are. Not being able to do so, they accept their limited capability, rather than their stupidity. Spectators laugh at the characters' stupidity throughout. In Estragon's plight, spectators may also find the joke funny but the funny trousers' joke reflects in the bigger frame their dismal and absurd situation which turns the spectators' possible laugh to a bitter one.

The other instance of parody of actions of *Waiting for Godot* in Stoppard's play can be detected where Ros is ordered by Guil to go upstage and find out whether Hamlet is coming:

GUIL: Go and see if he is there.
ROS: Who?
GUIL: There.
ROS *goes to an upstage wing, looks, returns, formally making his report*.
ROS: Yes.

> GUIL: What is he doing?
> ROS *repeats movements*.
> ROS: Talking.
> GUIL: To himself?
> ROS *starts to move*. GUIL *cuts in impatiently*. (51-52)

The same kind of action is originally displayed in *Waiting for Godot* when Pozzo orders Lucky to do things for him:

> POZZO: […] (*To Lucky.*) Coat! (*Lucky puts down the bag, advances, gives the coat, goes back to his place, takes up the bag.*) Hold that! (*Pozzo holds out the whip. Lucky advances and, both his hands being occupied, takes the whip in his mouth, then goes back to his place. Pozzo begins to put on his coat, stops.*) […] Whip! (*Lucky advances, stoops, Pozzo snatches the whip from his mouth, Lucky goes back to his place.*)… (7)

The similarities of these comic actions in both plays are noticeable; however, the differences are noteworthy, as well. The audience watching Beckett's play cannot laugh heartily at what Lucky does, or if they laugh it is but a bitter laugh, because the relationship between Pozzo and Lucky is that of master to slave. The sympathy the audience feel for the oppressed Lucky with his wretched situation renders the whole funny gag a gloomy, thought-provoking, and bitter one. In Stoppard's play, on the contrary, the relationship between Ros and Guil is that of friendship –even a more intimate friendship than the friendship between Vladimir and Estragon, let alone the master-slave relationship. There is little or no sense of oppression in Stoppard's equivalent scene. The comic element is dominant. Stoppard, thus, turns the whole situation to his advantage and his own goal, which is "to entertain a roomful of people" (Ambushes 6).

3.2.3 Character Traits

The other kind of the parody of *Waiting for Godot* traceable in Stoppard's *RAGAD* is the parody of character traits. Ros and Guil display some of the characteristic traits of Vladimir and Estragon, such as their disorientation and memory lapses; however, these traits in the characterizations of Ros and Guil are artistically engineered to elevate the comic rather than the absurd situation in which they are enmeshed.

Stoppard's play starts with presenting "*Two* ELIZABETHANS *passing the time in a place without any visible character*" while one is sitting and the other one is standing (11). Almost the same image is pictured at the beginning of *Waiting for Godot* (1). The two characters of Stoppard's play, Ros and Guil, are disoriented from the viewpoint of both place and time. Their disorientation is underlined by the stage direction of the play: when the run of heads in their coin tossing game amounts to seventy-sex, Guil worried by its implications "*gets up but has nowhere to go*" (12); thus he carries on his flipping coins. Later Ros wants to find out which way they came in and Guil tries to determine the directions of North and South. Not being able to locate the sun, Guil endeavors to "establish the direction of the wind" in order to estimate the direction of South (59). The whole situation turns to a funny one when Ros misunderstands Guil:

> GUIL: I'm trying to establish the direction of the wind.
> ROS: There isn't any wind. *Draught*, yes.
> GUIL: In that case, the origin. Trace it to its source and it might give us a rough idea of the way we came in-which might give us a rough idea of south, for further reference.
> ROS: It's coming up through the floor. (*He studies the floor.*) That can't be south, can it?
> GUIL: That's not a direction. Lick your toe and wave it around a bit.
> ROS *considers the distance of his foot.*
> ROS: No, I think you'd have to lick it for me.
> *Pause.*

GUIL: I'm prepared to let the whole matter drop.
ROS: Or I could lick yours, of course. (59)

The same kind of disorientation of characters, from the view point of place, is detectable in Beckett's Vladimir and Estragon; however, this trait is not treated comically by Beckett:

ESTRAGON: In my opinion we were here.
VLADIMIR: (*looking round*). You recognize the place?
ESTRAGON: I didn't say that. (3)

Or a bit later:

VLADIMIR: But you say we were here yesterday.
ESTRAGON: I may be mistaken. (3)

Beckett's characters are disoriented in the second act of the play, too. This time it is the blind Pozzo who wants to know where he is:

POZZO: Where are we?
VLADIMIR: I couldn't tell you. (32)

The disorientation of the characters in *Waiting for Godot,* unlike Stoppard's play, is not to add to the comic dimension of the characters or the scenes. It is rather used by Beckett to display the incapability of characters\human beings of knowing where they are when confronted with an incomprehensible world. It adds to the absurdity of the situation of the characters.

The protagonists of Stoppard's play are disoriented from the view point of time, as well –just like the characters in *Waiting for Godot*. When Ros and Guil are in the boat, for instance, Ros wants to know what he had said before they wandered off. Guil then asks:

GUIL: When was that?
ROS (*helplessly*): I can't remember. (107)

Stoppard, then, turns the whole situation to a comic scene:

GUIL (*leaping up*): what a shambles! We're just not getting anywhere.

ROS (*mournfully*): Not even England. I don't believe in it anyway.
GUIL: What?
ROS: England. (107)

There are similar scenes in *Waiting for Godot* where the characters display their disorientation in regard to time. For example, when Estragon wants to know when their appointment with Godot is to take place, he asks:

ESTRAGON: You're sure it was this evening?
VLADIMIR: What?
ESTRAGON: That we were to wait.
VLADIMIR: He said Saturday. (*Pause.*) I think.
ESTRAGON: You think.
VLADIMIR: I must have made a note of it. (*He fumbles in his pockets, bursting with miscellaneous rubbish.*)
ESTRAGON: (*very insidious*). But what Saturday? And is it Saturday? Is it not rather Sunday? (*Pause.*) Or Monday? (*Pause.*) Or Friday?
VLADIMIR: (*looking wildly about him, as though the date was inscribed in the landscape*). It's not possible!
ESTRAGON: Or Thursday?
VLADIMIR: What'll we do? (3)

The characters are not sure about the day they have an appointment with Godot, nor are they sure of the day it is at the time they speak.

The disorientations of the characters in both plays fall within the bigger frame of their unreliable memory. In both Stoppard's play and Beckett's, the characters have unreliable memories; however, each playwright employs this trait for a different purpose. In Stoppard's play, Ros and Guil display their memory lapses when they try to remember how long they have been spinning coins:

GUIL (*more intensely*): We have been spinning coins together since---(*He releases him almost as violently.*) This is not the first time we have spun coins!
ROS: Oh no—we've been spinning coins for as long as I remember.
GUIL: How long is that?
ROS: I forget….. (14-15)

The memory lapses of Ros and Guil are stressed throughout the play. Still in another part of the play, the dialogues indicate the characters' memory lapses:

> GUIL: …What's the first thing you remember?
> ROS: Oh, let's see…the first thing that comes into my head, you mean?
> GUIL: No—the first thing you remember.
> ROS: Ah. (*Pause*.) No, it's no good, it's gone. It was a long time ago. (16)

The same kind of trait, memory lapses, are also amongst the characteristic traits of Vladimir and Estragon in Beckett's play. When Vladimir vaguely remembers the tree, he asks Estragon about it:

> VLADIMIR: …. Do you not remember? We nearly hanged ourselves from it. But you wouldn't. Do you not remember?
> ESTRAGON: You dreamt it. (21)

Elsewhere:

> VLADIMIR: What was I saying, we could go on from there.
> ESTRAGON: What were you saying when?
> VLADIMIR: At the very beginning.
> ESTRAGON: The very beginning of WHAT?
> VLADIMIR: This evening . . . I was saying . . . I was saying . . .
> ESTRAGON: I'm not a historian. (23)

Vladimir, like Guil, is more conscious about what has happened, although he cannot remember everything clearly. Estragon, just like Ros, is weaker in memory and can remember almost nothing. Beckett uses these memory lapses, along with different capabilities of remembering things, to add to the absurd dimension of his play. On the contrary, Stoppard utilizes the same traits in order to add to the playfulness of his play. Almost all the conversations which underline the unreliability of the characters' memory ultimately lead to a comic dialogue or a funny spectacle in Stoppard's play.

Stoppard's play, thus, copies some of the characteristic features of Beckett's *Waiting for Godot* and treats them playfully, if not comically. Some

of the dialogues and verbal games in *RAGAD* are parodies of Beckett's play. Besides, some of the actions characters perform in Stoppard's play in addition to some of the character traits -like their disorientation and memory lapses- are indeed borrowed from Beckett's play; however, they are all treated playfully by Stoppard and are intended to augment the comic dimensions of his play.

3.3 Other Scattered Parodies

Stoppard's *RAGAD* displays some other parodies which are not like the parodies already mentioned. These parodies take place in much smaller proportions compared to the previously-mentioned ones. Most of these parodies, moreover, can be categorized under the category of discourse parody because they, except the parodies of a line of the Bible and a line of Osborne's *The Entertainer*, are not parodies of a specific text or a specific genre. These parodies include the parody of probability rule, the parody of academic languages, and the parody of attentive audience of a play. There are still two more parodies -the parody of a line of the Bible and the parody of a line of Osborne's *The Entertainer*. These two parodies are specific parodies.

Right at the beginning of the play, Ros and Guil are found flipping coins which land heads up one after the other for ninety-two times. Although the coin tossing and the coins themselves can signify a whole range of implications – including symbolic ones- they can also be interpreted from the view point of parodic imitation. In the first act of *RAGAD* when Ros and Guil meet the band of the players, Guil gambles with the Player by flipping coins. The coins still land heads up. The spinning of coins is repeated for eight more times and all the coins still land heads up. Altogether, there occur one hundred times of landing coins heads up consecutively. The situation defies the expectation of the audience according to logic and probability rules. The heads-up landing of one hundred coins, thus, defies the probability rule. Based on the probability rule,

the chance of landing a coin heads up is fifty percent – ½. If the second coin is to land heads up –which itself has fifty percent chance- right after the first one, the chance is ½ x ½ which equals ¼. And if four coins are to land heads up consecutively, the chance equals 1/16 (because ½ x ½ x ½ x ½ = $1/2^4$=1/16= 0.00390625), which is practically unlikely enough. Then, if one hundred coins are to land heads up consecutively, the chance will be $1/2^{100}$ which means 7888609052 x 10^{-31}. In practical life this chance only and only equals impossibility. Stoppard's presentation of the occurrence of this impossible chance to his protagonists –two Elizabethans- can be interpreted as a joke directed towards the probability rule –although it can signify a wide range of implications other than this, too. The comic dimension of the situation is intensified when Stoppard dramatizes Ros as a character who does not show any surprise:

> *The run of "heads" is impossible, yet* ROS *betrays no surprise at all –he feels none. However, he is nice enough to feel a little embarrassed at taking so much money off his friend. Let that be his character note.* (11)

The whole spectacle becomes funny when Ros's not noticing the impossibility of the situation is contrasted by Guil's awareness of the impossibility of the situation. The comic scene gets still funnier when Guil shows his worries about the situation by a series of parodical syllogisms which are his attempts to understand and explain the impossibility of the run of heads (16-19). Stoppard, thus, displays the probability rule and at the same time creates comic scenes based on it.

Another instance of discourse parody in *RAGAD* can be seen in the syllogistic speculations of Guil. He tries to account for the unaccountable phenomenon of landing coins heads up for ninety-two times consecutively – ninety-two times because Ros and Guil have not yet seen the Player and his band. His second and third syllogisms are:

> GUIL: [...] Syllogism the second: One, probability is a factor which operates within natural forces. Two, probability is not operating as a factor. Three, we are now within un-, sub- or supernatural forces. Discuss. (ROS *is suitably startled*. *Acidly*.) Not too heatedly. (17)

Ros who is shocked not because of understanding their situation but because of not understanding his friend's speech asserts: "I'm sorry I—What's the matter with you?" Then, Guil being still in his previous air and mood –academics' mood- continues and explains his next syllogism:

> GUIL: […] If we postulate, and we just have, that within un-, sub- or supernatural forces the *probability* is that the law of probability will not operate as a factor, then we must accept that the probability of the first part will not operate as a factor, in which case the law of probability *will* operate as a factor within un-, sub- or supernatural forces. And since it obviously hasn't been doing so, we can take it that we are not held within un-, sub- or supernatural forces after all; […] (17)

Guil refutes his previous seemingly-logical discussion and Stoppard displays his playfulness. What all these speculations lead to renders the situation still funnier. Guil carries on his syllogisms and then suddenly exclaims:

> GUIL: […] and for the last three minutes on the wind of a windless day I have heard the sound of drums and flute….
> ROS (*cutting his fingernails*): Another curious scientific phenomenon is the fact that the fingernails grow after death, as does the beard. (17-18)

All the speculations of Guil are indeed imitations of the academic languages where every bit of thought is uttered on a logical line. Guil's imperative sentence, "Discuss", makes it more obvious that he is mimicking the academics –or teachers. Stoppard, however, turns the whole dialogue to a comic one by the sudden change of Guil's focus to a trivial sound –the sound of drums and flute. Ros's interactions and replies add to the comic dimension of the whole situation. First, Ros is shown shocked and baffled and then when he understands a bit of what his friend asserts, he deflates the syllogism and

continues it with a trivial not-related subject matter, that "fingernails grow after death".

There is yet another parody in *RAGAD* that can be categorized under the category of discourse parody. The original target of this imitation is the audience of a play (Homan 109, Brassell 49, Gabbard 27). In his *RAGAD*, Stoppard mostly portrays the lives of Ros and Guil when they are not playing in Shakespeare's *Hamlet*. There are times when Ros and Guil, while they are on the stage in Stoppard's play, watch what happens in *Hamlet*. In a way, they are actors-spectators; Guil refers to it when at the end of the play he says: "Well, we'll know better next time" (26). The amazement and bafflement with which Ros and Guil watch *Hamlet* demonstrate the exaggerated feelings of the attentive audience of a play, perhaps *RAGAD* itself which is watched by an audience while Ros and Guil parody them. There are many instances of this kind of parody in Stoppard's play, one of which happens when Ros and Guil enter Elsinore and for the first time in the play watch the scene between Hamlet and Ophelia (34-35). Occupying the downstage, Ros and Guil seem to understand nothing of what is displayed before them on the upstage. Standing on the stage as if they are offstage, Ros and Guil are not capable of finding a clue about the onstage *Hamlet*.

In the second act of the play, Ros and Guil appear watching their own lives and destinies in Shakespeare's drama, acted out by the band of players (82). At this time, Guil refers to their roles when he admonishes Ros: "Keep back—we're spectators" (79). In spite of the striking likeness of the plot of the play acted out by the band of the players with what is happening and what will happen to Ros and Guil and in spite of the similarities of the clothes of spy-players with those of Ros and Guil and even in spite of the explanations and hints of the Player –including "traitors hoist by their own petard" (82) and "Are you familiar with this play?" (83), Ros and Guil are not capable of apprehending that the play performed before them is presenting their own lives. Ros and Guil watch the play amazed and puzzled. The whole scene can display how Stoppard parodies the audience of a play –of course, with a bitter critical

edge because he shows that Ros and Guil\audience cannot figure out that the play is about them, not some other people. From the immediate omniscient view point of the audience who are presented the aforementioned scene, the dramatic irony of the situation of Ros and Guil becomes funny because the audience find themselves detached from it; after all, none of the audience feels himself\herself so dolt as Ros and Guil in their situation.

The parody of a line of the Lord's Prayer in the Bible occurs five times in Stoppard's *RAGAD*. Guil is the one who parodies the Bible; after all, he is the more intelligent character of the duo and thus probably more familiar with the Bible –he reminds Vladimir in *Waiting for Godot* who talks about the Bible (2).

> ROS: You made me look ridiculous there.
> GUIL: I looked just as ridiculous as you did.
> ROS (*an anguished cry*): Consistency is all ask!
> GUIL (*low, wry rhetoric*): Give us this day our daily mask.
> ROS (*a dying fall*): I want to go home…. (39)

> GUIL (*snaps*): Guildenstern!
> ROS (*jumps*): What?
> *He is immediately crestfallen*, GUIL *is disgusted*.
> GUIL: Consistency is all I ask!
> ROS (*quietly*): Immortality is all I seek…
> GUIL (*dying fall*): Give us this day our daily mask…
> *Beat* (45)

> ROS *puts up his head listening*.
> ROS: There it is again. (*In anguish*.) All I ask is a change of ground!
> GUIL (*coda*): Give us this day our daily round …
> HAMLET *enters behind them, talking with a soldier in arms.* (93)

> ROS: He's got us.
> GUIL: And we've got nothing. (*A cry*.) All I ask is our common due!
> ROS: For those in peril on the sea…
> GUIL: Give us this day our daily cue.
> *Beat, pause. Sits. Long pause.*

ROS (*After shifting, looking around*): What now? (102)

ROS sits beside GUIL. *They stare ahead. The tune comes to an end.*
Pause.
ROS: I thought I heard a band. (*In anguish.*) Plausibility is all I presume!
GUIL (*coda*): Call us this day our daily tune…
The lid of the middle barrel flies open and the PLAYER*'s head pops out.* (114)

In all the instances, Guil imitates the line of the Bible which reads: "Give us this day our daily bread" (Matthew 5:11, Luke 11:3); of course, with difference. In addition, the context in which these imitations are used –regarding what happens and what is said before and after the imitations- render the whole situation playful, if not comic; thus, they are parodies.

There is an instance of the parody of a phrase in Stoppard's *RAGAD*. This time it is the Player who imitates with difference. When the band of the players meets Ros and Guil for the first time, the Player addresses Ros and Guil "as fellow artists" (23) and to the amazement of Ros, who exclaims "I thought we were gentlemen", responds as follows, putting on an air of significance: "For some of us it is performance, for others, patronage. They are two sides of the same coin, or, let us say, being as there are so many of us, the same side of two coins" (23). He bows and exclaims "Don't clap too loudly—it's a very old world". As Bigsby notices, the Player imitates Archie Rice's less metaphysical remark in *The Entertainer* (13). In Osborne's *The Entertainer* Archie Rice says: "Don't clap, it's a very old building". The player, feeling he has just said something witty and of importance, is suddenly deflated by the reactions of Ros, Guil, and the other players who do not clap for him. Ros's immediate remark after the exclamation of the Player makes the situation more playful for the audience; Ros asks: "What is your line?" That none of the characters finds the Player's remark witty, that none of the characters claps for him, and that the sudden change of the conversation is initiated by Ros's question which shifts

the Player's monologue to an irrelevant matter display Stoppard's dexterities to dramatize a playful scene and to parody a phrase of Osborne's play.

3.4 Conclusion

Stoppard's *RAGAD* is full of parodies; however, there are also a wide range of borrowings and influences which are detected by a host of critics. Stoppard's applications of miscellaneous parodies in his *RAGAD* and in his other works are so abundant that some critics refer to his canon as 'the battle of books' or the 'theatre of parody' (Sammells 16). Many critics have tried to find the influences, parallels, allusions, resemblances, echoes, and genesis of Stoppard's *RAGAD*. Most of these borrowings, influences, etc, however, cannot be placed under the category of parody.

A short list of the original sources of these parallels, recallings, borrowings, etc. in *RAGAD* can be: James Saunders' *Next Time I'll Sing To You*, Ludwig Wittgenstein's *Philosophical Investigations* and his famous language game, T. S. Eliot's *The Love Song of J. Alfred Prufrock*, *Marina*, and *Murder in the Cathedral*, Luigi Pirandello's *Six Characters in Search of an Author*, John Osborne's *Look Back in Anger* and *The Entertainer*, Rene Magritt's *The Human Condition*, C. S. Gilbert's *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern*, Edward Albee's *The Zoo Story*, Ernest Hemingway's *A Clean Well-lighted place*, Samuel Beckett's *Endgame*, Oscar Wilde, Frantz Kafka, Harold Pinter, Arthur Miller, Shavian debates, West End Farce, Dadaists, who-dun-it genre, music hall routines, and lazzi of commedia dell'arte.

Some other critics have also investigated the relationship between Stoppard's personal life and his *RAGAD*. Stoppard himself acknowledges the host of the unconscious influences detectable in his *RAGAD* by his witty analogy:

> When I'm talking about my own work to somebody, my relationship with them is rather like that of a duped smuggler confronted with a custom officer. I truthfully declare that I am indeed responsible for this piece about two specific individuals in a particular situation. Then he starts ransacking my luggage and comes up with all manner of exotic contraband like truth and illusion, the nature of identity, what I feel about life and death – and I have to admit the stuff is there but I can't for the life of me remember packing it. (Hunter 2005:109-110)

What Stoppard remarks underlines one of the significant determining criteria for defining parody. Even if the similarities and imitations which are traceable in *RAGAD* treat their original subjects playfully, there exists little, if any, assurance that Stoppard intentionally imitates them; hence, the term 'parody' cannot be applied for these similarities and imitations.

To sum up briefly, the parodies which are detectable in Stoppard's *RAGAD* can be first and foremost the parodic depiction of characters, plot, and some themes of Shakespeare's *Hamlet*; all of these parodies can be categorized as specific parodies. The second group of parodies in *RAGAD* embraces the parodies of the characterizations and the style used in Beckett's *Waiting for Godot*; all of these parodies are also specific ones. Compared to the first two groups of parodies, the third group of parodies in *RAGAD* occurs much less often and constitutes a far less portion of the play. The parodies of the probability rule, academic language, and attentive audience of a play are discourse parodies in this group. The parodies of a line of the Bible and a line of Osborne's *The Entertainer*, on the other hand, are specific parodies, which belong to the third group of parodies in *RAGAD*.

CHAPTER 4

THE REAL INSPECTOR HOUND

Stoppard writes in his 'Preface' to *Tom Stoppard Plays One: The Real Inspector Hound and Other Entertainments* that he initially started writing his next stage play after *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern Are Dead* in 1960. During the following years, the play underwent some drastic changes until it finally opened under the title of *The Real Inspector Hound* at the Criterion Theatre on 17 June 1968. *The Real Inspector Hound* was Stoppard's only work performed in the West End between 1967-1972 (Dean 1981: 45). After its first London production[1] in 1968, which was directed by Robert Chetwyn and was on a double bill with Sean Patrick Vincent's *The Audition*, the play was staged again in Shaw Theatre in November 1972. "This time the other half of the bill was Stoppard's *After Magritte* which has since become a regular partner to *The Real Inspector Hound*" (Gabbard 58). In April of the same year, the first New York production of the play opened at Theatre Four, where it was staged together with *After Magritte*. In 1985, Stoppard himself directed a National Theatre performance of it.

Like his earlier stage play, *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern Are Dead*, Stoppard's *The Real Inspector Hound* is overtly derivative depending on a dual structure and necessitating its audience's familiarity with the play's forebears (Dean 1981: 46). There are a number of similarities, structurally and thematically, between the two plays, which are delicately expounded by Lucina Paquet Gabbard in her *The Stoppard's Plays* (58-69); however, one of the major distinctions between them can be their different public receptions. Although in both plays parody is the main underlying strategy, the more farcical application of a variety of parodic strategies in *The Real Inspector*

[1] For a list of the play's important productions consult Appendix C.

Hound culminated in its being received differently by various reviewers at the time it was first opened. "The reviews", Dean positively recalls, "were generally favourable but somewhat critical of the overtly farcical nature of the work" (1981: 45). Whatever the hostile or friendly reviews were at that time, after many years, the play "begins to look like Stoppard's most durable work for the theatre" (Billington 62).

The Real Inspector Hound commences with showing its audience's image in a huge mirror. Two theatre critics sitting among the audience watch a ludicrous whodunit performed on the stage. The thriller inaugurates with a pause and there is an onstage corpse unnoticed by the actors. Watching the thriller, the two theatre reviewers express their critical opinions about it. They on and off reveal their inner wishes and obsessions in their monologue-like dialogues. One of them, Moon, ponders on his position as a second-string critic and dreams about killing his superior critic, Higgs, in order to become the first-string critic of his magazine. Having had some kind of love affair with the actress playing Felicity Cunningham in the thriller just the night before, Birdboot, the other critic, notices a more beautiful actress, the one playing Cynthia Muldoon, and instantly falls in love with her. By and by, the two critics get involved in the actions of the thriller. First Birdboot finds himself on the stage while he is taken for the actor Simon Gascoyne; in the play, Simon has had a love affair with Felicity and now wants to call it off because he has found a more beautiful lady, Cynthia. Birdboot enjoys his onstage role. As Simon was shot in the second act of the thriller, Birdboot is shot on the stage but he is killed in a (more) real manner. Before he is shot, he discovers the real identity of the corpse lying on the stage as that of Higgs, Moon's superior critic. Moon, who has hitherto been able to keep himself on his seat as a spectator, jumps on the stage and he soon finds out that he is taken for the actor Inspector Hound. The critics' seats in the first row are now occupied by the actors who were playing Simon and Inspector Hound. Trying to discover who really killed his critic friend, Birdboot, and his superior critic, Higgs, Moon is entirely enveloped by the thriller. Magnus, the actor, then accuses Moon of not being

the real Inspector Hound and then unmasks himself as the Real Inspector Hound. Moon, however, recognizes him as Puckeridge, his own stand-in critic. He then understands that both Higgs and Birdboot were (more) really killed by Puckeridge. Trying to escape, Moon is shot by Magnus-the Real Inspector Hound-Puckeridge. The stand-in's stand-in then announces that he has gained his lost memory and introduces himself as Albert, Lady Muldoon's missing husband. Having witnessed all this, "*with a trace of admiration*", the dying Moon asserts: "Puckeridge…you cunning bastard" and then he dies (Hound 44).

The dramatic structure of *The Real Inspector Hound* initially displays a main play and a play within it. The main-frame play is about two theatre critics who attend the debut performance of a thriller in order to review it for their separate journals. The inner play is a clumsily written whodunit. Although the main-frame play and the play-within-the-play have their courses of actions separate from one another at the onset of the play, they merge at the end of it and become one play.

The main-frame play, both when it is distinguishably separate from the inner play and when it blends into the inner play, parodies the tribe of theatre critics who with their personal desires and obsessions proclaim their biased and subjective observations. The inner play, on the other hand, first and foremost parodies the whodunit genre, then -and even now- in vogue and almost in its summit when Stoppard wrote his farce. The parody of whodunits is traceable both when the inner play is discernable from the main-frame play and when they unite. Although there are a number of specific works suggested as the other original subjects of parody in the inner play of *The Real Inspector Hound*, it can be studied as a parody of Agatha Christie's celebrated work, *The Mousetrap*.

4.1 Parody of Audience and Critics

Stoppard's *The Real Inspector Hound* humorously dramatizes two spectators who watch a thriller. It is later revealed that these spectators are two drama reviewers who are sent to review the debut of a thriller. Stoppard pokes laughter at them by letting them talk humorously about their wishes. The critics' critical observations about the thriller they watch are also presented comically, parodying a range of critical styles and habits. The critics get involved in the actions of the whodunit in a ridiculous way. The parody of critics is further underlined when two of the actors, Simon and Inspector Hound, take the seats of the previous critics, Moon and Birdboot. In their speeches, Simon and Inspector Hound who are now the critics of the thriller use some of the words and phrases which Moon and Birdboot uttered earlier when they were criticizing the whodunit; these words and phrases playfully highlight the former critics' mannerism in their public voices. The new critics then become parodies of Moon and Birdboot, displaying Stoppard's self-parody – they parody the former parodied critics' critical speeches and styles.

In a way, *The Real Inspector Hound* inaugurates with its own audience rather than its actors. The mirror Stoppard calls for in his first stage direction of the play is to reflect the spectators' image to themselves:

> *The first thing is that the audience appear to be confronted with their own reflection in a huge mirror. Impossible. However, back there in the gloom –not at the footlights– a bank of plush seats and pale smudges of faces.* (Hound 5)

When the desired "mock-auditorium" (Sammells 56) effect is well-established, the pale smudges of faces are progressively faded until only the first row remains and from that row, two men, Moon and Birdboot, are visible (Hound 5). The two men are then two members, rather two representatives, of the audience of the thriller which is going to be staged.

In the mock-auditorium, the mock-audience is represented by two men whose first characteristic is their being parodies of the audience of the play; however, they are parodies of theatre critics, as well. Their being parodies of the audience is also highlighted by their personal wishes being dramatized comically in the play. Moon's ambition is to become the first-string critic in his journal by murdering his superior critic, Higgs. Birdboot, the womanizing critic, on the other hand, wants to make love with every beautiful actress he meets, in spite of his being married. The critics' private ambitions and wishes typify the audience's. They are animated "images of the secrets of audience response" (Gabbard 62); this is further underlined by Stoppard's stage set which calls for a huge mirror to reflect the spectators' images to themselves. The joke thus, Neil Sammells contends, "is on us" and "we laugh at our own reflection reflected in the palpable disorientations of the thriller" (59). *The Real Inspector Hound* is a play that

> invites us to recognize the anxious and inhumane pretensions of our usual ego-life, to relish their absurdity as we slough them off, and to identify ourselves for the duration of the performance with that playful process of liberation. (Whitaker 114)

By engaging his audience\ critics in the thriller, Stoppard pokes laughter at their wishes and funnily dramatizes that the result of their wish-fulfilment is nothing but death.

Besides parodying the audience's wishes and their fulfilments, Moon and Birdboot humorously exhibit the sense of superiority, felt by the audience, in regard to the actors of plays. This kind of feeling is obvious in Birdboot's statement "[…] a man of my critical standing is obliged occasionally to mingle with the world of footlights" (Hound 9-10). The spectators, like Moon and Birdboot, feel that they are real while the actors are in the illusory world of theatre. This audience-like feeling is however parodied when Moon and Birdboot find themselves enveloped by the play they are sent to review. Moon, who warns Birdboot against losing his job and social position if he gets

involved in the thriller, finds himself engaged in the course of the actions of the thriller and, when he wants to come back to his seat to keep his superiority over the actors, he finds out that his and his colleague's seats are already occupied by the actors playing Simon and Inspector Hound (Hound 40). Moon loses his aloofness and thus his superiority, just as his critic friend lost his earlier. The result of their getting involved in the thriller –their wish-fulfilment- is their deaths. The impossibility of the situation, hinted at the beginning of the play by Stoppard's commentary stage direction –"Impossible" (5)- increases the humour of the critics' entrapment in the thriller, leaving the dead spectators\critics as parodies of the audience of the very play staged.

From a broader perspective, the play presents a theatre with its audience and its stage play. The conventions of theatre necessitate the separation of audience from actors. In other words, there must be an obvious distinction between reality and fiction/illusion in theatre. *The Real Inspector Hound* mocks the conventions of theatre by blurring the boundaries between its audience and actors, between reality and illusion. Although it seems impossible, Stoppard manages to create the effect through the mirror and the funny engagement of Moon and Birdboot, as parodies of the audience, into the thriller. Their humorous replacement by Simon and Hound –as new representatives of the audience- further highlights the farcical nature of Stoppard's intention. With its conventions, theatre as a whole thus is another subject of parody in *The Real Inspector Hound*.

As the performance goes on, however, it is revealed that Moon and Birdboot are two theatre critics sent to review the opening performance of the thriller they are watching. In an interview Stoppard delineates why he has given the roles of critics to his mock-audience characters, Moon and Birdboot.

> The one thing that *The Real Inspector Hound* isn't about, as far as I'm concerned, is theatre critics. I originally conceived a play, exactly the same play, with simply two members of an audience getting involved in the play-within-the-play. But when it comes to actually writing something down which has integral entertainment value, if you like, it very quickly turned out that it

> would be a lot easier to do it with critics, because you've got something known and defined to parody. So it was never a play *about* drama critics. If one wishes to say that it is a play about something more than that, then it's about the dangers of wish-fulfilment. But as soon as the word's out of my mouth, I think, shit, it's a play about these two guys, and they're going along to this play, and the whole thing is tragic and hilarious, and very, very carefully constructed. (Ambushes 8)

Although Stoppard is strongly against highlighting the critic dimensions of his characters, he dramatizes them as mock-critic personae of his play, too. Stoppard's earlier brief career as a play reviewer has certainly helped him a lot in his characterization of Moon and Birdboot (Gussow 1-2). His negative opinion about critics, as thinkers rather than doers (Times 1219), finds its way into his ridiculous presentation of Moon and Birdboot, too.

At any rate, Moon and Birdboot can be distinguished as parodies of reviewers, as well as audience, of plays. The parodic critics are themselves parodied in a further extension of the critic parody in the characters of Simon and Inspector Hound. The parodic presentation of Moon and Birdboot can be detected in both their private and public voices[1]. The parody of critics still continues as the two distinct voices mingle when the critics get engaged in the thriller. In their private voices, Moon and Birdboot ludicrously demonstrate their narcissistic wishes and daydreams. In their public voices they parody critics' language and jargons with a variety of humorous specifications. Their wish-fulfilments are also dramatized humorously in order to poke fun at reviewers.

The private conversations between Moon and Birdboot have almost nothing to do with the play they are sent to review. Their private voices echo their private lives and desires, which have parallels with the actors' desires and ambitions which they exhibit in the thriller's plot; in a way, it is the reason why the critics get involved in the thriller. The comedy around the critics' private voices and desires arises mainly from the characteristics of the language they

[1] As Stoppard notes in his stage direction, Moon and Birdboot sometimes have a "*public voice, a critic voice which they turn on for sustained pronouncement of opinion*" (Hound 15).

use as well as their unintentionally comic actions culminating in their absorption in the thriller they watch.

Humorous repetition of sentences and phrases by Moon and Birdboot in their private voices introduces the farcical nature of the roles they have in the main-frame plot of *The Real Inspector Hound*. Right from the beginning of the play when Birdboot joins Moon, the question "Where is Higgs?" is reiterated no fewer than six times:

> BIRDBOOT: Where's Higgs?
> MOON: I'm standing in.
> BIRDBOOT AND MOON: Where's Higgs?
> MOON: Every time.
> BIRDBOOT: What?
> MOON: It is as if we only existed one at a time, combining to achieve continuity. […] When Higgs and I walk down this aisle together to claim our common seat, the oceans will fall into the sky and the trees will hang with fishes.
> BIRDBOOT (*he has not been paying attention, looking around vaguely, now catches up*): Where's Higgs?
> MOON: The very sight of me with a complimentary ticket is enough. The streets are impassable tonight, the country is rising and the cry goes up from hill to hill–Where–is–Higgs? (Hound 6)

They repeat the question a couple of times later, too. The repeated question has no answer for the critics, in spite of the corpse they see onstage –the corpse that is later identified as Higgs. Furthermore, Moon's embellished monologue-like response to a simple question not only seems ridiculous because of his extravagantly used language devices but it also baffles Birdboot: "BIRDBOOT *regards him doubtfully for a moment*" (6). The recapitulation of the question insinuates that they cannot understand each other or at least they do not attend to each other.

A philandering star-maker reviewer, Birdboot repeatedly betrays himself as such until finally he cannot control himself and gets engaged in the thriller where he publicly displays himself so. His hypocritical rage to refute Moon's gentle insinuations about his womanizing temperament not only

uncovers what he defensively tries to hide but also is ridiculously repeated again and again:

> BIRDBOOT: […] you could do yourself some good, spotting her first
> time out–she's new, from the provinces, going straight to top. I don't want to put words into your mouth but a word from us and we could make her.
> MOON: I suppose you've made dozens of them, like that.
> BIRDBOOT (*insanely outraged*): I'll have you know I'm a family man devoted to my homely but good-natured wife, and if you're suggesting– (Hound 8)

A short while later, Birdboot is furious again just before Felicity enters:

> MOON: Who was that lady I saw you with last night!
> BIRDBOOT (*unexpectedly stung into fury*): How dare you! (*More quietly*) How dare you. Don't you come here with your slimy insinuations! My wife Myrtle understands perfectly well that a man of my critical standing is obliged occasionally to mingle with the world of footlights, simply by way of keeping *au fait* with the latest.
> MOON: I'm sorry–
> BIRDBOOT: That a critic of my scrupulous integrity should be vilified and pilloried in the stocks of common gossip– (Hound 9)

When Felicity plays her role in the inner play, Moon recognizes her as the lady whom he had seen Birdboot with the night before. Birdboot again "*inhales with fury*" once more repeating his defending lines (Hound 17). Shortly after, Cynthia enters to play her role in the whodunit. Birdboot who is still defending himself angrily notices her suddenly:

> BIRDBOOT: A ladies' man! … Why, Myrtle and I have been together for
> –Christ!–who's *that*?
> (*Enter* LADY MULDOON *through French windows. A beautiful woman in her thirties* […])
> […]
> BIRDBOOT: She's *beautiful* –a vision of eternal grace, a

poem… (Hound 18)

It is humorous to watch a critic of Birdboot's self-advertised "scrupulous integrity" betray himself so swiftly and over just a beautiful actress. Birdboot's repeated denial of his negative trait in a hypocritically pompous language and his reiterated betrayal of himself sketch a funny portrait of the private life of the critic.

Another humorous aspect of the critics' speeches is that a large portion of the conversations they have with each other in their private voices do not seem to be dialogues, at all. They are rather stream of consciousness–like monologues revealing the critics' absorption in their own dreams and wishes.

> BIRDBOOT: Do you believe in love at first sight?
> MOON: It's not that I think I'm a better critic–
> BIRDBOOT: I feel my whole life changing–
> MOON: I am but it's not that.
> BIRDBOOT: Oh, the world will laugh at me, I know…
> MOON: It's not that they are much in the way of shoes to step into…
> BIRDBOOT: …call me an infatuated old fool…
> MOON: …They are not.
> BIRDBOOT: …condemn me…
> […]
> BIRDBOOT: Ah, the sweet madness of love…
> MOON: …of the spasm of the stairs…
> BIRDBOOT: Myrtle, farewell… (Hound 22-23)

Moon talks about his ambition of taking the place of the first-string Higgs while Birdboot thinks about leaving his wife in order to have a love affair with the beautiful actress, Cynthia. Their monologue-like dialogues are humorous in themselves because the critics seem to address one another while they talk about different things. In addition, Stoppard's assigning these wishes to two 'critics', who are supposed to concentrate on the thriller and to review it objectively, adds to the comedy of the play and further builds up the critics' parodic picture.

The monologue-like dialogues exchanged between Moon and Birdboot sometimes lead to their aural misunderstanding creating comically ironical scenes for the audience. When Moon speaks about his stand-in, Puckeridge, Birdboot, in his public voice, comments on the whodunit:

> (MOON *and* BIRDBOOT *are on separate tracks*.)
> BIRDBOOT (*knowingly*): Oh yes….
> MOON: Yes, I should think my name is seldom off Puckeridge's lips…sad, really. I mean, it's no life at all, a stand-in's stand-in.
> BIRDBOOT: Yes…yes…
> MOON: Higgs never gives me a second thought. I can tell by the way he nods.
> BIRDBOOT: Revenge, of course.
> MOON: What?
> BIRDBOOT: Jealousy.
> MOON: Nonsense–there's nothing *personal* in it–
> BIRDBOOT: the paranoid grudge–
> […]
> MOON: What?
> BIRDBOOT: The answer lies out there in the swamps.
> MOON: Oh.
> BIRDBOOT: The skeleton in the cupboard is coming home to roost.
> MOON: Oh yes. (*He clears his throat ... for both he and* BIRDBOOT *have a "public" voice, a critic voice which they turn on for sustained pronouncements of opinion*)
> (Hound 14-15)

Moon's private dream-like speech is not attended to by Birdboot. It takes Moon quite a while to understand that his friend is talking about the thriller. The audience, however, is well aware that the critics are talking about different things, specifically with Birdboot's formal tone and his repeated "yes/oh yes" which he pompously uses when he is talking in his public/critic voice.

Displaying parodies of critical observations, the reviewers' different public voices, used when they comment on the thriller, sketch them humorously, too. Their public voices feature a variety of comic characteristics and parody a range of critical styles. Having presented his critics' private wishes, Stoppard insinuates how the critics' reviews and comments are under

the impact of their biased mindsets and private wishes. In a comic engagement of the critics in the actions of the thriller, their wishes are fulfilled. As a result of their wish-fulfilment, the critics are murdered at the end of the play. In an extended parody of critical observations, Stoppard parodies the already parodied reviewers by substituting them for the two actors of the thriller.

The chocolate-munching sensualist Birdboot is portrayed as a philandering star-maker critic who takes "everything at face value" (Sammells 56). The ambitious Moon, on the other hand, is pictured as a pensive critic who tends to find "eternity in a grain of sand and cosmic significance in the third-rate" (Billington 65). Birdboot's criticism is "tabloid commonsense" aimed at an ordinary audience while Moon's is "upmarket intellectualism" pointed to elitist readers (Sammells 56). Each of these critical observations humorously proffers a number of critical styles.

Birdboot's inanity appears right at the beginning of the play in a comic manner. Taking a seat next to Moon, the "*plumpish middle-aged*" Birdboot whispers:

> BIRDBOOT (*sitting down; conspiratorially*): Me and the lads have had a meeting in the bar and decided it's first-class family entertainment but if it goes on beyond half-past ten it's self-indulgent—pass it on… (Hound 6)

Birdboot's only criterion for determining the quality of the whodunit is thus the time it takes to be performed. In addition, his remark insinuates that his critical response is more or less predetermined before watching the debut of the play. His hasty judgment and thereupon his inanity are further revealed in his decision about the genre of the play:

> BIRDBOOT: […] I mean it's a sort of *thriller*, isn't it?
> […]
> BIRDBOOT: It's a whodunit, man!–Look at it!
> (*They look at it*. *The room*. *The* BODY. *Silence*.)
> (Hound 7)

None of the actors of the inner play has yet entered the stage when Birdboot, based on what he "has heard" and with only a dead body on the stage, categorizes the play as a "whodunit". Although Birdboot's observation has an informative function for the audience of Stoppard's play, it comically dramatizes critics' habit of insistence on categorizing their reviewed plays.

Birdboot's opinion about the performance of the actors, or rather just beautiful actresses, constitutes the other part of his critical observations. Stoppard presents this part of Birdboot's observations humorously, too. Having unintentionally betrayed his philandering nature, Birdboot, watching Felicity's performance on the stage, addresses Moon: "I told you—straight to the top—" (Hound 17). Although the audience can already guess that there must have been a kind of sexual relationship between Birdboot and Felicity, the following dialogue between the reviewers unveils it clearly because Moon remembers that he had seen Birdboot with Felicity the night before (Hound 17). Later, when Birdboot is still defending himself against Moon's insinuated charges, Cynthia, a more beautiful actress than Felicity, enters. Birdboot suddenly stops defending himself and experiences "love at first sight" and "sweet madness of love" (Hound 22). In his public voice, Birdboot then comments on Cynthia's performance:

> BIRDBOOT: Yes…yes…A beautiful performance, a collector's piece. I shall say so.
> MOON: A very promising debut. I'll put in a good word.
> BIRDBOOT: It would be as hypocritical of me to withhold praise on grounds of personal feelings, as to withhold censure.
> […]
> MOON: […] The fact is I genuinely believe her performance to be one of the summits in the range of contemporary theatre. (Hound 22)

Ironically, while Birdboot is bombastically praising Cynthia's performance, Moon supposes that his colleague is talking about Felicity's performance. Birdboot soon discloses the object of his praise:

BIRDBOOT: The part as written is a mere cipher but she manages to make Cynthia a real person—
MOON: *Cynthia*?
BIRDBOOT: And should she, as a result, care to meet me over a drink, simply by way of er—thanking me, as it were—
MOON: Well, you fickle old bastard! (Hound 23)

The aim of Birdboot's praise –in his professional observation- then is only to receive the actress's sexual favour. While Birdboot comically and unwittingly divulges that he is a womanizing star-maker, Stoppard parodies biased critical observations, cynically insinuating that reviewers and their critical observations are under the influence of their private desires and wishes.

Birdboot is dramatized comically in his actions, too. Besides his funny engagement in the thriller and 'being mingled with the world of footlights', Birdboot whose entire review of a play has been recently reproduced in neon "at the Theatre Royal" carries its colour transparencies with a battery-powered viewer to show off (Hound 10-11). The vanity of his handing over the viewer to Moon after his ironical understatement, in which he refers to the reproduction of his entire review as "Oh…that old thing" (Hound 11), adds to his comic portrayal and pictures him as a "strip-carton kind" character (Hunter 1982: 201).

Moon's critic voice is intended to parody a range of critical observations, as well. He is a pretentiously pensive critic whose bombastic criticism humorously digs beneath the surface of what is staged before him. He comments both on the thriller and the performance of one of the actresses. While Moon comments on the thriller, Stoppard pokes fun at his observations, dramatizing parodies of a variety of critical techniques and clichés.

Moon's comic insistence on intellectual depth can be traced right from the beginning of the play. While his colleague labels the play they are watching as "a thriller", Moon insists they should consider the "Underneath" (Hound 7). His comment is even shocking for his colleague who thus asks "*Underneath*?!? It's a whodunit, man!—Look at it!" (Hound 7). Moon's observation turns out to

be funny when it is considered that the thriller has not yet started and none of its characters has entered the stage yet. His comment becomes funnier when the thriller is performed and it proves to be a farcical whodunit written clumsily and without any intellectual depth.

After watching the first act of the thriller, Moon's humorous insistence on intellectual depth can still be traced in his comments. In his pompously bombastic critic-voice, he funnily delves into the hidden meanings of the farcical thriller:

> MOON: […] There are moments, and I would not begrudge it this, when the play if we can call it that, and I think we can, aligns itself uncompromisingly on the side of life. […] For what in fact is this play concerned with? It is my belief that here we are concerned with what I have referred to elsewhere as the nature of identity. […] I think we are entitled to ask—*where is God*?
> BIRDBOOT (*stunned*): Who?
> MOON: Go-od.
> BIRDBOOT (*peeping furtively into his programme*): God?
> MOON: I think we are entitled to ask. (Hound 24)

While "nothing that Moon says here is in any way related to the trivial piece that he is watching" (Brassell 95), his over-stretching a "simple farce" (Gabbard 67) to such an extreme end as to mean concepts like 'identity' and 'God' is comic. Birdboot's aural as well as his visual reaction –to peep "*furtively into his programme*" in order to find the name of God, as a character- turns the scene to a hilarious farce.

After the second act of the thriller, Moon still endeavours to show off the depth of his critical observations. This time he goes as far as finding symbols in the farce he is watching:

> MOON: If we examine this more closely, and I think close examination is the least tribute that this play deserves, I think we will find that within the austere framework of what is seen to be on one level a country-house week-end, and what a useful symbol that is, the author has

> given us—yes, I will go so far—he has given us the human condition— (Hound 31-2)

Although Moon's inappropriate criticism is humorous enough, Stoppard still enhances the humour by having Birdboot talk about something quite different. While Moon bombastically comments on the theme of the farcical thriller, Birdboot, who has just fallen in love with Cynthia, praises her performance to be sexually rewarded by her (Hound 32). Parallel with their private voices which let their wishes slip out in monologue-like dialogues, the critics' critical comments are in different tracks and are not attended to by the other one. Their criticisms are under the impact of their private desires; Moon desires to be the first-string critic so he pretends to have talent by seeing 'eternity in a grain of sand' and Birdboot wants to enjoy having a sexual relationship with the actress so he praises her performance. Moon's humorous observation, which becomes hilarious in the context of his dialogues with Birdboot, parodies symbol-finding reviews which intend to find a symbol where it is not.

The humour in Moon's critical observation is further enhanced by his application of foreign terms, inappropriate references, and ridiculous metaphors. Referring to the farcical thriller, Moon pompously "*clears throat*" and observes: "Let me at once say that it has élan while at the same time avoiding éclat"[1] (Hound 24). He resorts to "nearly synonymous foreign phrases to mold a pretentious language full of self-evident, self-important statements" (Hu 68).

In addition, Moon's reliance on "grotesque and inappropriate references" (Hu 68) can be detected when, at the end of the second act of the thriller, he asserts "An uncanny ear that might belonged to Van Gogh"[2] (Hound 32). Moon's humorous reference here, Billington observes, is a parody of "the

[1] The French words 'élan' and 'éclat' are synonymous denoting 'style' in a piece of literary work.

[2] There seems to be a typing mistake in the edition of the play used in this study. Moon's sentence must have been "An uncanny ear that might have belonged to Van Gogh".

critical habit of keeping one eye on the stage and another alert for a quotable phrase" (65).

Moon's bombastic metaphors are also ridiculous. Pointing to "the outsider", "the disruptions", and "the comfortable people" of the thriller, for instance, he calls them: "the catalyst figure", "the shock waves", and "these crustaceans in the rock pool of society", respectively (Hound 15). In a way, his metaphors are comparable to the funny metaphors and similes Mrs. Drudge uses in the thriller –for instance, referring to the fog covering the area, she says "it rolls off the sea without warning, shrouding the cliffs in a deadly mantle of a blind man's buff" (Hound 12).

Moon's critical observations parody the critical habit of source finding and Freudian psychological criticism, too. Watching the first act of the thriller, Moon comments that it is "Derivative" (Hound 11). After the second act of the whodunit, Moon who is delving to find the sources of the "Derivate" thriller observes:

> MOON: Faced as we are with such ubiquitous obliquity, it is hard, it is hard indeed, and therefore I will not attempt, to refrain from invoking the names of Kafka, Sartre, Shakespeare, St. Paul, Beckett, Birkett, Pinero, Pirandello, Dante and Dorothy L. Sayers. (Hound 32)

Moon's irrelevant enumeration of some famous literary authors as the sources of the trivial and farcical thriller sounds funnier in his attempt to keep them in an alliterative order. Dropping the name of Birkett, who does not seem to be a (well-known) literary writer, mischievously is Stoppard's red herring –parallel to the red herrings offered in the thriller- for the source-hunter critics of his play –to search in vain for that name in literary Encyclopaedias where they cannot find it. In addition, it does not look like an accident "that four of the names on that list are dramatists who were presumed to have influenced Stoppard in the writing of his previous stage play [-that is, *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern Are Dead*-]" (Billington 65). Whatever Stoppard's intentions in assigning Moon such observation may have been, his mocking "the critical penchant for

regarding any work of art as a network of hidden influences" is his most obvious objective (Billington 65).

In his hyperbolic upmarket intellectualism, Moon humorously approaches the farcical thriller from a psychological perspective. Watching Simon kissing Cynthia, Moon comments:

> MOON: The son she never had, now projected in this handsome stranger and transformed into lover—youth, vigour, the animal, the athlete as aesthete—breaking down the barriers at the deepest level of desire. (Hound 19)

Since Moon's bombastic criticism is applied to a trivial thriller devoid of interpretive significance and since it is put forward by a (mock-) critic whose sole objective, as he has hitherto revealed, is to surpass the first-string critic, Higgs, through pretending to have intellectual depth, his critical observation turns out to be ridiculous, mocking psychological approaches –or rather Freudian psychological approach- applied by critics and reviewers when they review a literary work.

Although Moon's critical observations, unlike his colleague's, are more concentrated on the thematic significance of the thriller, once he comments on the performance of one of the actresses. Stoppard, however, derives laughter from Moon's serious judgement about Felicity's performance. Moon, who was earlier asked by Birdboot to look closely at Felicity's performance, does not notice that his colleague has already shifted his favour from Felicity to Cynthia. Supposing he is supporting Birdboot's favourite actress, Moon comments: "Trim-buttocked, that's the word for her" (Hound 23). In a short while, he realizes that Birdboot is praising Cynthia's performance hoping to be sexually favoured by her. The aural confusion created by Moon's misunderstanding his critic friend is humorous. The "banality" of Moon's observation, as Dean describes it (49), after his heated excitement to "put in a good word" for the "very promising debut" is ludicrously deflating (Hound 23).

As they get enveloped in the thriller they are sent to review, Moon and Birdboot lose their daydream-like private voices as well as their professional gestures. Before Moon gets thoroughly involved in the thriller –that is, before the frame plot of the critics merges thoroughly into the inner plot of the thriller– the fading frame-play plot introduces a reversal. Inspector Hound and Simon, the fictional actors in the thriller, now take the seats of the (more) real characters, Moon and Birdboot. In their less fictional roles in the fading frame plot, Hound and Simon, now critics, pass their severe critical commentaries on the thriller and on the performance of its persona ruthlessly. While Stoppard still parodies critics and their critical jargons through Simon and Inspector Hound, he exhibits a self-parody, a parody of his earlier parodied critics, as well.

Simon who has just occupied one of the critics' seats criticizes the thriller:

> SIMON: To say that it is without pace, point, focus, interest, drama, wit or originality is to say simply that it does not happen to be my cup of tea. One has only to compare this ragbag with the masters of the genre to see that here we have a trifle that is not my cup of tea at all. (Hound 40)

Impersonating a reviewer who always tries to find faults with the play he watches, Simon repeats a couple of phrases that Birdboot uttered earlier. At the beginning of the play Birdboot says that the thriller is "not exactly her [his wife's] cup of tea" (Hound 7) and after the second act of the thriller he positively asserts "the author has taken the trouble to learn from the masters of the genre" (Hound 31). Simon, however, uses Birdboot's phrases in order to deny the existence of any merit in the thriller.

Following this, Simon and Hound repeat Moon's foreign terms, which might be well-remembered by the audience because of their meaningless application:

> SIMON: […] hysterics are no substitute for *éclat*.

HOUND: It lacks *élan*. (Hound 40)

Simon then continues his criticism. This time he severely comments on the performance of the actors:

> SIMON: Some of the cast seem to have given up acting altogether, apparently aghast, with every reason, at finding themselves involved in an evening that would, and indeed will, make the angels weep. (Hound 40)

Before Simon and Hound start to talk about the thriller, Moon who is standing on the stage "*makes swiftly for his seat*" and "*is stopped by the sound of voices*" (40). He then "*freezes*" on the stage bewildered and astonished (40). In his severe criticism, Simon, thus, points to Moon's performance. The new critics not only parody Moon's pompous triteness in his application of foreign terms but also criticize his performance while he does not know what to do in his newly given-by-force identity.

Soon Moon, who is onstage, learns that Higgs is murdered. He tries to escape but is shot by Magnus, who is recognized by Moon as Puckeridge. Through presenting and subverting the class system of critics, as Puckeridge becomes the first-string critic by murdering Higgs and Moon, Stoppard underlines the hierarchical class system of society and parodies it. Moon, who himself is a second-string critic, dreams of being number one. In his dream, which echoes his wishes, he sees:

> a revolution, a bloody *coup d'etat* by the second rank—troupes of actors slaughtered by their under-studies, magicians sawn in half by indefatigably smiling glamour girls, cricket teams wiped out by marauding bands of twelfth men […] an army of assistants and deputies, the second-in-command, the runners-up, the right-hand men— […] (Hound 7)

Moon's dream comes true by his comic engagement in the thriller where he learns that Higgs is dead. It becomes amusingly ironic when both he and his superior, Higgs, are killed by the third-string critic, Puckeridge[1].

In his *The Real Inspector Hound*, Stoppard parodies the audience of plays in the characters of Moon and Birdboot. In both their private voices and professional ones, Moon and Birdboot comically represent two critics whose critical observations are highly influenced by their personal desires; thus, they parody critics, too. In a further extension of this parody, Stoppard parodies these two critics by making Simon and Inspector Hound take the critics' seats.

4.2 Parody of Whodunits: A Genre Parody

With its Victorian roots popularized by the detective (and mystery) stories written by Edgar Allan Poe and Arthur Conan Doyle, crime fiction manifested itself as a favourite genre for the public during the twentieth century. The evidence for this popularity is the enormous numbers of published and sold crime fictions in the world during the twentieth century. During the second half of the twentieth century many writers tested their talents by attempting to write such fictions; however, none has yet been able to surpass the popularity that Agatha Christie[2] has achieved in the genre.

The stereotypical nature of crime fictions can be detected in their conventional plots and characters as well as their use of a variety of some other stock clichés. Crime fictions typically start with a crime and end with solving

[1] In a way, Stoppard's third-string critic, Puckeridge, and his second-string reviewer, Moon, represent the marginalized and suppressed groups of society who were taking a stand during the 1960s.

[2] As Guinness Book of World Records notes, Christie is the best-selling writer of books of all time; only the Bible is known to have outstand her collected sales of roughly four billion copies of novels; UNESCO also mentions that Christie is currently (as in the year 2008) the most translated individual author in the world (qtd. in Wikipedia, the Free Encyclopedia).

the mystery behind it and apprehending the criminal. Their exposition involves introducing a crime and a suspect on the loose. The mysterious crime usually is a murder made known to the public via police reports. The suspect is on many occasions an 'outsider' with a shady past, a rakish young man present at the scene of the crime as an 'uninvited guest' who knows the household well; this kind of suspect is more common in a kind of crime fiction known as 'country-house crime fiction'[1]. Suspense is increased by pointing suspicion to the mysterious 'outsider'. A shrewd sleuth, sometimes with eccentric habits, tries to solve the mystery behind the crime. Using rational reasoning and presupposing that a crime unravels as clock work, the sleuth discovers an important familiar clue which is unnoticed by the others. Traditional crime fictions portray their detectives as impeccable and unblemished characters. The suspect as often as not turns out to be innocent. The readers then learn that the 'outsider' has been only a red herring. In the course of apprehending the culprit, there might be an unmasking of a shrewd sleuth who has presented himself as another character – as in some of Agatha Christie's works, especially *The Mousetrap*. The sleuth apprehends the criminal and then he explains the mystery behind the committed crime in a story-telling manner. After the chaos, the lost order is restored and life goes on normally for the characters.

Crime fictions usually rely on suspense, chance, and coincidence heavily. Surprise is also an indispensable ingredient of the genre. The police messages about the crime and a criminal on the loose often generate the initial suspense. Suspense increases as the stock 'outsider' and 'sleuth' are introduced. Surprise is brought about by turning the 'suspicious outsider' character to a red herring. Sometimes a twist in the plot or an unexpected ending creates surprise, too. Such surprises usually rely on chance and coincidence, which, one way or

[1] Sometimes this kind of crime fiction is casually referred to as cosy crime fiction and sometimes it is named "country-house crime story" (Hunter 1982: 40). The kind almost reached its acme of popularity by Agatha Christie's works. It often displays a crime committed in a secluded country house –typically an English manor- owned by a bourgeois family. After the mystery of the crime is solved by a shrewd sleuth, who usually possesses eccentric habits –such as Hercule Poirot and Miss Marple- and after order is restored, life continues for the characters happily.

the other, play an important role in the generic crime fictions; however, they are occasionally applied to an improbable extent, leading to an implausible characterization and plot –the implausibility of the genre can be easily detected in its typical plot, where the sleuth nearly always discovers the mystery behind the committed crime and apprehends the criminal. The overhearing of characters talking about a serious subject at a critical moment, which is itself another cliché characteristic of crime fictions, underlines such a usage of coincidence.

In the country-house crime fictions, like Christie's *The Mousetrap*, the setting is typically a country-house residence, usually an English manor. The house is secluded from the outside world by some atmospheric or topographical condition right at the critical moment of the story. The seclusion of the house is often used in order to reinforce the suspense of the story by increasing the danger threatening the household while they have no way to escape from the house or to get external help. The telephone-cut is usually introduced for the same reason.

Besides the stock characters of 'sleuth' and 'outsider', common in typical crime fictions, the country-house thrillers may less often introduce two other cliché characters usually referred to as the 'vivacious hostess' and 'trim-buttocked girl'. The 'vivacious hostess' is often an attractive middle-aged woman with some secrets in her life. The trim-buttocked girl is typically a simple artless young girl. There are usually some other guests invited to the manor by the hostess. In the course of the story, the party in the manor is usually presented with characters eating and drinking. The characters may be presented as playing some card games, too.

Although crime fiction is one of the most favourite genres for public readers, most of its conventions are well worn-out. Besides parodying critics, Stoppard's another main concern in *The Real Inspector Hound* is to parody this popular genre. He applies almost all of the stereotypical conventions of crime fictions in his play and at the same time mocks them. His parody of the genre

can be traced in his ridiculous imitation of crime fictions' formulaic plot, characters, settings, and some other stock elements.

4.2.1 Plot

In the thriller staged in *The Real Inspector Hound*, Stoppard parodies the staple plot of crime fictions. Before the main-frame plot overlaps the inner-play plot, the exposition of crime fictions is parodied by the way the thriller begins. While the main-frame plot merges into the whodunit plot and then leads to the unmasking of the real police agent, the stock complication and denouement of the crime genre are ridiculed. The critical observations of Moon and Birdboot on the plot of the play-within-the-play highlight the stereotypical nature of the plot of the whodunit and, at the same time, invite the audience of the play to laugh at its conventionality.

The inner play commences with "Mrs. Drudge the Help" who "*heads straight for the radio*" and switches it on (Hound 8-9). Exactly timed, the radio announces that there is an interruption "for a special police message" about the country police's search for a madman "around Muldoon Manor", where the thriller takes place (Hound 9). Mrs. Drudge turns off the radio and continues her dusting towards the onstage telephone set. She dusts the phone "*with an intense concentration*", displaying amateurishly that she is "*waiting for it to*" ring. When it rings, she snatches the receiver up:

> MRS. DRUDGE (*into phone*): Hello, the drawing-room of Lady Muldoon's country residence one morning in early spring?...He*llo*!—the draw—Who? Who did you wish to speak to? I'm afraid there is no one of that name here, this is all very mysterious and I'm sure it's leading up to something, I hope nothing is amiss for we, that is Lady Muldoon and her houseguests, are here cut off from the world, including Magnus, the wheelchair-ridden half-

> brother of her ladyship's husband Lord Albert Muldoon who ten years ago went out for a walk on the cliffs and was never seen again—and all alone, for they had no children. (Hound 11)

Relying "too heavily" on only one element of theatre, the fictional playwright amateurishly and swiftly starts his play in an unrealistic manner, blatantly giving the necessary information to his audience only by "the technique of dramatic exposition through dialogue" (Hu 64). First the starting radio message which has been waited for by the char creates an amateurish suspense and then Mrs. Drudge humorously bursts out telling the setting of place and time, the major characters' names and their biographies, and the mysterious dramatic atmosphere. The char actually speaks as the fictional playwright's talking stage direction –she reiterates the same funny role at the beginning of the second act of the thriller (24). It becomes hilarious for the spectators when they realize that she tells all this information, in addition to her irrelevantly funny creation of suspense, by asserting the mysterious nature of the situation, to a wrong-number caller.

Simon's appearance, as the stock 'new comer' or 'outsider', increases the initial suspense necessary in the whodunit; however, his too early arrival, just after the police bulletin, and his realization of his looking suspicious by creeping in and out make the situation more artificial and less realistic. His following conversation with Mrs. Drudge, comparable to the maid's blurting out unnecessary information to a wrong caller, is redundantly used to convey more information about the settings of the thriller. Simon's emergence at the beginning of the thriller playfully helps the maid create the exposition. Verbal description and descriptive dialogues, thus, create the humorous exposition of the inner play, "presenting in the compressed course of a single French scene within three or four minutes of stage time, information that does not arise naturally in the course of the characters' conversations" (Hu 65).

The main-frame plot running along the exposition of the whodunit increases the hilarity of the situation. Birdboot and Moon who have just heard

Mrs. Drudge's information told to a wrong-number caller comment on it in their pompously mannerist public voices:

> MOON: Derivative, of course.
> BIRDBOOT: But quite sound. (Hound 11)

Moon's redundant observation that the exposition of the inner play is "derivative" and Birdboot's inanity to accept it as "sound" reveal Stoppard's parallel comic intention in presenting both a parody of critics and a parody of the stereotypical exposition of whodunits while the first one highlights the comicality of the latter.

The conventional exposition of the whodunits, with exact timing for turning on the radio to broadcast the interrupting ominous police report about a criminal on the loose and with mysterious 'new-comers', is the main original subject of the parody in the exposition of the inner play of *The Real Inspector Hound*. Stoppard pokes fun at these conventions by his heavy reliance on dialogues uttered by the maid and Simon. Notwithstanding, the parodic dimensions of Stoppard's hilarious exposition can also be extended to embrace the "lazy cliché of many 1930's realist plays" as well as "the sheer technical inefficiency of some amateur productions" (Hunter 1982: 40).

After the exposition, the thriller continues with complicating its plot. It presents two acts and then the plot is repeated with different characters; first Birdboot and then Moon, from the play's main-frame plot, take the roles of Simon Gascoyne and Inspector Hound in the whodunit plot, respectively. In its complication and repetition, the plot of the thriller ridicules the plot of crime fictions with their predictable stock conventions. Furthermore, when the main-frame plot is still separate from the plot of the inner play, the critics' commentaries ironically stress the predictable nature of the stock plot of the thriller.

The first two acts of the inner play complicate the mystery humorously. In the first act the radio is switched on another time, this time by Simon who is alone on the stage and feels "*a strange impulse*" to turn it on (Hound 14). Again

it is exactly the time for a police report about the madman on the loose (Hound 14). The 'outsider', Simon, introduces himself to the char swiftly and he reveals that he knows the lady of the house. The stranger and the other household members then play a card game and the first act finishes. Besides poking fun at the cliché police messages broadcast on the radio in thrillers, Stoppard's plot of the thriller presents the stock 'outsider' character with a shady past in the first act. Birdboot's following observation that "the skeleton in the cupboard is coming home to roost" (Hound 15) both stresses the conventionality of the plot in its introducing the formulaic 'outsider' and foreshadows what will happen to Simon.

Like its first act, the second act of the thriller starts with Mrs. Drudge, who continues her role as the fictional playwright's talking stage direction:

> MRS. DRUDGE (*into phone*): The same, half an hour later? …
> No I'm sorry—there's no one of that name here.
> (Hound 24)

The humour of the situation still derives from the maid's irrelevant reply to a wrong-number caller. The plot continues with parodying the tedium of eating and drinking common in country-house crime fictions or, as Hunter suggests, common in "clumsily-written realist plays" (1982: 40).

> MRS. DRUDGE: Black or white, my lady?
> CYNTHIA: White please.
> (MRS. DRUDGE *pours*.)
> MRS. DRUDGE (*to* FELICITY): Black or white, miss?
> FELICITY: White please.
> (MRS. DRUDGE *pours*.)
> MRS. DRUDGE (*to* MAGNUS): Black or white, Major?
> MAGNUS: White please. (Hound 24-5)

Mrs. Drudge repeats her questions when she offers sugar and biscuits, too. Her repetition of "Black or white" is meant by the fictional playwright to stress that the characters drink coffee not tea; however, it is an irrelevant emphasis. The cliché scene is so boring for Birdboot, the sensational critic, that he

immediately writes down "The second act, however, fails to fulfil the promise…" (Hound 25).

The radio then is turned on for the third time, this time by Felicity, to interrupt its program for another police report (Hound 25). The police bulletin does not mention the name of Inspector Hound at all –the name of the detective, Inspector Hound, was announced in the first two radio police messages when, in the first one, Mrs. Drudge was alone on the stage and, in the second one, Simon alone was the listener (Hound 9, 14). The other actors, thus, have not heard the name of the police detective and must not know about him. On the contrary, just after the third police message, Magnus starts talking about Inspector Hound and it becomes clear that Felicity knows him, too:

> MAGNUS: Hound will never get through on a day like this.
> CYNTHIA (*shouting at him*): *Fog*!
> FELICITY: He means the Inspector.
> CYNTHIA: Is he bringing a dog? (Hound 26)

The actors talk about Inspector Hound while they must not know about him because they were not present when the radio announced his name. This scene underlines Stoppard's intention to present the whodunit as unconvincingly as he can and thereupon draw attention to the implausible nature of the generic crime fictions.

Inspector Hound then arrives and is frustrated that there has been no crime or trouble in Muldoon Manor. While leaving Inspector Hound notices a corpse just under his feet, the corpse has been lying there on the stage all the while since the thriller started; yet none of the actors has seen it. Stoppard's ironical fun of the genre reveals itself more intensely here. While the crime fictions typically tend to start with a crime already discovered and a sleuth who discovers a familiar clue unnoticed by others, Stoppard's whodunit presents the crime –that is, the corpse- as the unnoticed clue discovered humorously by Inspector Hound, who has to find the culprit.

The plot of the thriller starts to get complicated as Inspector Hound points to the missing Simon as the murderer of the onstage dead man. Inspector Hound identifies the corpse as Albert, Cynthia's long-time missing husband, and humorously insists on his belief while Cynthia repeatedly assures him that the murdered man is not her husband (Hound 29-30). Inspector Hound, who has misidentified the corpse, then wants everyone to search for the murderer, Simon. While all the actors are searching to find him, Simon enters the empty stage and is shot dead. Hiding the first corpse under the sofa, Inspector Hound faces Cynthia to ask her "And now—who killed Simon Gascoyne? And why?" (Hound 30-31). While the other actors should have asked these questions to Inspector Hound who is "masterminding the operation", he himself asks them as if the other actors are to provide him with an answer. Since his question finishes the second act of the thriller, it is inappropriately applied to highlight the suspense already created awkwardly in the thriller. At the same time, it parodies the stock cliff-hanging suspense[1] of crime fictions and TV crime serials which at the end of each episode tend to create a cliff-hanging suspense.

Along with the thriller, the reviewers' critical observations are manipulated in order to enhance the humour of the thriller, mainly derived from presenting the hackneyed conventions of the genre awkwardly. Just before Simon is shot, for instance, Birdboot prophecies: "This is where Simon gets the chop" (Hound 30). His prognostication of Simon's immediate death, in addition to his earlier foreshadowing about Simon's death (Hound 20), stresses the predictability of the plot of the thriller because of its conventionality. After the second act of the thriller, Birdboot points to the conventionality of the thriller:

> BIRDBOOT (*clears throat*): […] The groundwork has been well and truly laid, and the author has taken the trouble to learn from the masters of the genre. He has created a real

[1] In some old serial movies or fictions a very strong element of suspect was on numerous occasions created at the end of each episode by leaving the hero hanging from the edge of a cliff or the heroine tied to the railroad tracks with the express train rapidly approaching. This kind of cliché suspense is sometimes referred to as cliff-hanging suspense and based on it the movie or fiction is often called 'cliff-hangers' (Perrine 45).

> situation, and few will doubt his ability to resolve it with a startling denouement. Certainly that is what it so far lacks, but it has a beginning, a middle and I have no doubt it will prove to have an end. (Hound 31)

His bombastic ironic comment on the plot of the thriller actually provides him grounds to admire Cynthia's performance, which he spells out with no hesitation. At the same time, his observation emphasizes the conventionality of the presented plot: the fictional playwright, after all, "has taken the trouble" to display the worn-out clichés used by "the masters of the genre". Still stressing the predictability of the plot of the thriller –and thus the genre's- Birdboot anticipates "a startling denouement" for it which is, along with its exposition, a major concern of Stoppard's parody of typical thrillers' plot.

Having already had its climax, the thriller starts to unfold hilariously. The falling action of the inner plot first engages Birdboot, from the main-frame plot, by his wife's onstage call and then envelopes Moon. Birdboot has just answered his wife's onstage call when the third act of the thriller starts. The audience then learns that the third act is a repetition of the first two acts. Birdboot has no choice but to stay on the stage because Felicity enters and her assigned theatrical dialogues, which are almost exactly the same as her previously assigned dialogues with Simon, are about her (more)[1] real last night relationship with Birdboot. Birdboot's real world –from his own point of view- overlaps Felicity's theatrical world. Being taken for Simon by the actors, Birdboot finds the object of his desire, Cynthia, in the now-semi-real-onstage world. The first two acts of the thriller then repeats swiftly; even the card game is repeated. This world becomes thoroughly real for Birdboot when he

[1] The word "more" is used in parentheses before real/really when talking about the participation of the critics, Birdboot and Moon, in the inner play. From the view point of the spectators, Birdboot and Moon are in the theatrical world both when their plot is separate from the plot of the thriller and when it fuses into the thriller's plot. Their theatrical world, however, is presented on a more real plane than the world of the actors in the thriller. The world of the critics, representing the audience of the thriller, is not real, compared to the real world of the spectators. Nor is it dramatized as theatrical as the world of the thriller's actors is portrayed. To display that their world is presented as the real world of the spectators but still it is within the frame of theatrical world, the word "(more)" is used when this plane of reality is referred to.

identifies the corpse as the first-string critic Higgs, who is (more) really dead. Just like Simon who was shot earlier, Birdboot is shot in the repetition of the thriller but he dies (more) really –of course, compared to Simon's theatrical death. Noticing his colleague's onstage death as real, Moon steps into the theatrical world of the thriller, being taken as Inspector Hound by the actors. In this now-semi-real world, Moon tries to discover who killed his critic friend. At this point the plot of the thriller introduces the conventional red-herrings. Aided by the stock convention of over-hearings, demonstrated by the maid, Moon figures out that almost all of the actors, who have already professed that they will kill Simon\Birdboot, had enough motives to do so. Moon's semi-real world becomes completely real when he identifies the first corpse as his superior critic, Higgs. Revealing himself as the Real Inspector Hound, Magnus proves that Moon is not Inspector Hound and Moon recognizes Magnus as his stand-in critic, Puckeridge. Perceiving that Puckeridge has cunningly planned to get rid of his superior critics, Moon tries to escape but he is shot and dies in his real world.

From a parodic perspective, the plot of the thriller in its repetition and especially in its denouement ridicules the conventional plot of crime fictions, explained earlier. Stoppard pokes fun at his thriller by introducing it in a circular structure, engaging Birdboot and Moon who are from a (more) real world; in the repetition of the thriller's plot, two members of the audience, Moon and Birdboot, take the places of two of the major characters in the thriller –that is, the 'suspect', Simon, and the 'sleuth', Inspector Hound- without any significant changes in the course of the actions. Stoppard makes fun of the stock plots of crime fictions by caricaturing their unrealistic emphasis on plot which is usually fixed to the extent that almost any member of the audience, or any character, can fill in the roles of thrillers' characters without harming its plot –typical thrillers, after all, emphasize plot and its actions more than characters and their plausible characterizations.

Although some crime fictions are constructed on a circular basis, such as Agatha Christie's *The Mousetrap*, their authors try to justify the circularity of

their plots. Stoppard's inner play, however, has a circular plot without establishing enough grounds for its repetition. The unjustified repetition of the thriller, in a way, underlines the unconvincing nature of the generic thrillers although it can more vividly display a parody of the circular plot of Christie's *The Mousetrap* –this parody will be explained in detail later.

The denouement staged in the thriller is itself another hilarious mockery of the conventions of the crime genre, earlier referred to. Stoppard's denouement mocks the unrealistic clichés of the genre, not only by letting his criminal go away with his crime but also by displaying the very criminal as the real representative of law. The unmasking cliché of crime fictions finds a hilarious extreme personification in the character of Magnus. After his thorough unmasking, he is revealed to be the criminal critic, actor Magnus, the Real Inspector Hound, and Albert, Cynthia's long-time missing husband. Instead of the lost order being restored, a new order is formed where the criminal is the real winner. In other words, Stoppard's thriller highlights the unconvincing nature of the generic crime plots, which presuppose a crime and its unravelling as clock work, by being unconvincing enough in its repetition[1] and unrealistic enough in its surprise ending.

Stoppard's parody of the stock plot of the crime genre is thus depicted through both parts of *The Real Inspector Hound*. When the main-frame plot is separate from the inner plot, the thriller displays its conventional exposition and complication humorously while the main-frame play stresses and increases the humour directed towards the inner play. Crime fictions' conventional falling action and denouement are also ludicrously staged, when the main-frame plot merges into the play-within-the-play.

[1] The circularity of the plot of the thriller along with its "startling denouement" –to use Birdboot's commentary (Hound 31)- echoes absurdist's conventions which are also underlined by Moon in his parodic attempt to find the sources of the trivial thriller; he mentions Beckett as one of its sources (Hound 32).

4.2.2 Characters

Stoppard's derision of the predictable conventions of the crime genre in *The Real Inspector Hound* is not limited to a parody of the stereotypical plot of crime fictions. He ridicules some other conventional plot elements of the genre, including its stock characters and their characterizations, too. The genre's staple characters ridiculed in *The Real Inspector Hound* are the 'murdered' –that is, the crime- the 'sleuth', and the 'outsider' or the 'uninvited guest'. The other characters including the maid and the country-house 'guests' with their 'vivacious widowed host' are presented humorously, too; however, they are more typical characters in country-house crime fictions.

The crime committed in the inner play of *The Real Inspector Hound* is a murder. The murdered body is on the stage right from the beginning of the play but an onstage sofa does not let the actors see it although it is visible to the spectators. The corpse remains undiscovered right at the feet of the actors for more than half the play's length until Inspector Hound discovers it. The dramatic irony is humorously intensified as the actors cover and uncover the corpse but do not notice it. Although visual humor derives from the unnoticed corpse, it displays the actors' "perceptual failure" (Hu 65). It, moreover, underlines Stoppard's accentuation and his poking fun at the improbabilities, based on chance and coincidence as discussed earlier, common to whodunits.

The initiating crime is Higgs' corpse and the thriller funnily exhausts the idea of crime and murder by providing corpse after corpse both theatrically and in a (more) real manner. The next dead body, who is theatrically murdered, belongs to Simon Gascoyne. As the inner play repeats, Birdboot's dead body becomes the next corpse; however, his death is pictured as a (more) real one. Just before Birdboot's death, he identifies the first corpse as Higgs, the critic, and thus Higgs' hitherto theatrical corpse becomes a (more) real one; in other words, he is portrayed as a dead body belonging to the (more) real plane of reality presented in the play. Moon's (more) real death at the end of the play

provides the last corpse. The play –and thereupon the whodunit- ends up with four corpses in total while it has already played with the idea of theatrical and (more) real corpse\crime. In typical crime fictions, the murdered\corpse, as the committed crime, is usually used to create the mystery and the mystery is solved by the sleuth in order to prevent the criminal from leaving more corpses. Stoppard's thriller begins with a corpse but unlike its generic predecessors it continues with more corpses and finishes with yet another corpse. Both using and subverting the conventions of the genre, Stoppard invites his audience to laugh at the genre's traditional crime\corpse which builds up its mystery.

The other parodied character in Stoppard's thriller is the generic 'sleuth', described earlier. Stoppard, however, parodies this conventional character by portraying his detectives humorously and by playing with the concept of 'detective' through introducing three of them in his play.

The first sleuth is Inspector Hound who is intended to poke laughter at his generic counterpart character. Before he enters, he is introduced by a police bulletin on the radio: "Inspector Hound, who is masterminding the operation, is not available to comment but it is widely believed that he has a secret plan" (Hound 14). Expecting to see a clever detective with "a secret plan", the audience watches a funny caricature of him: "*Enter* INSPECTOR HOUND. *On his feet are his swamp boots. These are two inflatable—and inflated—pontoons with flat bottoms about two feet across. He carries a foghorn*" (Hound 26). His visually ridiculous entrance takes place just after the humorous conversations of the actors about the name of the detective –as Cynthia misunderstands the inspector's name and is astonished that the police have sent a police hound to search for the madman. Stoppard, however, makes sure he has exhausted every possible means to derive laughter from the entrance of his Inspector Hound so he calls for a mournful hound baying getting louder and louder as Inspector Hound gets nearer to the manor. The "*scary*" hound baying stops when Inspector Hound enters 'alone' (Hound 26).

After such a hilarious arrival, Inspector Hound displays a good deal of verbal humour. Addressing Lady Muldoon, as if she has been waiting for him,

he exclaims "I came as soon as I could" (Hound 26). In a short while, he reveals that he himself does not exactly know why he is there:

> HOUND: Well, what's it all about?
> CYNTHIA: I really have no idea.
> HOUND: How did it begin?
> CYNTHIA: What?
> HOUND: The…thing.
> CYNTHIA: What thing?
> HOUND (*rapidly losing confidence but exasperated*): The trouble!
> CYNTHIA: There hasn't *been* any trouble!
> […]
> HOUND: I see. (*Pause*.) This puts me in a very difficult position. (*A steady pause*.) Well, I'll be getting along, then. (*He moves towards the door*.)

His following misunderstanding enhances the verbal humour:

> HOUND: […] You never know, there might have been a serious matter.
> CYNTHIA: Drink?
> HOUND: More serious than that, even.
> CYNTHIA (*correcting*): Drink before you go? (Hound 27)

The comic inspector accidentally discovers the corpse rather than the mystery behind the crime, which is typical of what his generic counterpart character would do. Standing on top of the corpse, he asks "Is there anything you have forgotten to tell me?" (Hound 29). His later persistence on identifying the corpse as Albert Muldoon, despite Albert's wife's repeated assurances that it is not her husband, dramatizes another comic dialogue.

Stoppard portrays his Inspector Hound as a sleuth arousing hilarious laughter, however, only to reveal at the end of the play that he is not the real Inspector Hound. While the thriller introduces Magnus as the Real Inspector Hound, it does not disclose who actually the first inspector was and why he came to Muldoon Manor introducing himself as Inspector Hound. His existence and his characterization are unjustified, underlying the unrealistic characterization of the typical sleuth character of the genre.

Taken for Simon, Birdboot does a part of what Inspector Hound did in the second act of the thriller; he discovers the corpse and identifies it as Higgs' dead body. It is Moon, however, who is taken as Inspector Hound in the repetition of the thriller. He also identifies the first corpse, Higgs, although he tries to hide his discovery. He attempts to find out who murdered his colleague, Birdboot. In the course of his investigation, Moon is portrayed in a comic manner as he accuses the actors one after the other only basing his accusations on what the maid asserts (Hound 41-2). In a parody of the generic 'sleuth', Moon who believes that he is a detective tries to explain the motives of the accused actors for committing the crime in a story-telling manner (42). Laughter is also derived from his explanations as they are not based on his investigation and as the audience knows that Moon is not a detective at all.

At the end the unfortunate new detective, Moon, is shot by Magnus who is, besides his other identities, the Real Inspector Hound. The Real Inspector Hound, however, is ironically the mastermind behind the crimes. His various identities, in different planes of reality dramatized on the stage, are disclosed at the end of the play in a ridiculous imitation of the unmasking cliché applied in some crime fictions. The real criminal thus solves the mystery of the crimes which he himself committed.

Stoppard's parody of the generic stock sleuth, thus, is not created only through the comic characterization of Inspector Hound. He pokes fun at such a conventional character, which can solve the mystery of crimes by his rational means, via introducing three inefficient detectives who are unconvincingly characterized and who cannot apprehend the criminal who unrealistically enough introduces himself as the last and the Real Inspector Hound.

As noted earlier, another stock character of the crime genre is 'the outsider'. Simon Gascoyne in the inner play of *The Real Inspector Hound* impersonates such a character, however humorously. In addition, Birdboot's repeating Simon's role –that is 'outsider's role'- emphasizes the conventionality of such a character and pokes laughter at it.

Simon Gascoyne appears as a criminal right at the beginning of the thriller. Mrs. Drudge who has just entered the stage turns on the radio and it announces the police's description of a "youngish" madman "of medium height and built" who is "wearing a darkish suit with a lightish shirt" (Hound 9). The police bulletin has not yet finished when "*a man answering this description*" appears right "*behind* MRS. DRUDGE" (9). Although Stoppard pokes fun at the slow and amateurish timing of events, he invites his audience to laugh at the conventionality of the generic character by making him appear right at the middle of the police report about him. The stage direction, furthermore, displays Simon "*acting suspiciously*": "*He creeps in. He creeps out*" (Hound 9). Stoppard's exaggeration of his typical trait –that is, being a suspect- is thus another source of humour in picturing the generic 'outsider'.

The humorous characterization of 'the outsider'\'uninvited guest' is also detectable in the speeches Simon delivers. Shortly after his appearance at the window, Simon who enters "*through the French windows*" "*more suspiciously than ever*" introduces himself as a friend by verbosely and unnecessarily explaining how he came to know the lady of the house (Hound 12). His following dialogue with the char is both irrelevant and humorous:

> SIMON: I took the short cut over the cliffs and followed one of the old smugglers' paths through the treacherous swamps that surround this strangely inaccessible house.
>
> (Hound 12)

His dialogue is intended by the fictional playwright to picture the setting of the place But his pouring out of such inappropriately detailed information to a maid is irrelevant and portrays him as an odd character especially when it is recalled that he is 'the suspicious outsider'.

A short while later, in spite of the fact that he was not invited to Muldoon Manor, Simon implies his being a guest when he asks the char "There is another guest, then?" (Hound 13). His question redundantly underlines his generic role as 'the suspicious uninvited guest'; a role that is further displayed

when Inspector Hound discovers the corpse while Simon, without any reason, becomes missing. His unjustified disappearance through most of the second act of the thriller draws attention to Stoppard's accentuation of the implausibility and inconvincibility of his generic role.

After being suspected by Inspector Hound and the other actors, Simon enters the empty stage and is shot while the others are searching for him. The suspect by his death proves to have been a red-herring of the whodunit. This kind of surprise, created by turning a suspect to a red-herring, is still another hackneyed cliché of the genre in characterizing 'the outsider'. The predictability of such a convention is emphasized by Birdboot's prophesies in the main-frame play. Early in the play, during the first act of the whodunit, Birdboot observes "Simon's for the chop all right" and then later, just before Simon is murdered, he foreshadows "This is where Simon gets the chop" (Hound 20, 30).

Stoppard underlines the predictability of the cliché character of 'the outsider' by making Birdboot step into Simon's role without causing any significant change in the course of events. Just like Simon, Birdboot changes his sexual attention from Felicity to Cynthia, who is more beautiful and attractive than the former one. Birdboot, like his counterpart, dies at the end. Stoppard, furthermore, ridicules the stock character by assigning Birdboot more or less the same dialogues and actions Simon delivered and performed earlier, insinuating that, being in the same situation, almost every member of the spectators, as Birdboot is a representative of them, can and will do the same actions and deliver the same speeches as the stock character does and utters. A part of Simon's dialogues with Felicity in the first act of the thriller is as follows:

> SIMON: Look, about the things I said—it may be that I got carried away a little—we both did—
> FELICITY(*stiffly*): What are you trying to say?
> SIMON: I love another!
> FELICITY: I see.

SIMON: I didn't make any promises—I merely—
FELICITY: You don't have to say any more— (Hound 16)

When Birdboot is engulfed in the thriller, he repeats nearly the same dialogue although now he is a representative of the audience of the play not an actor:

BIRDBOOT: And about last night—perhaps I gave you the wrong impression—got carried away a bit, perhaps—
FELICITY(*stiffly*): What are you trying to say?
BIRDBOOT: I want to call it off.
FELICITY: I see.
BIRDBOOT: I didn't promise anything—[…]
FELICITY: You don't have to say any more— (Hound 33)

The dialogues between Birdboot and Felicity become funnier when their contextual double imports are taken into consideration. Based on the information provided earlier, before Birdboot gets enveloped in the thriller, the audience has already learned that Birdboot has had a kind of affair with the actress Felicity. Now watching the other actress, he wants to call his first affair off in order to establish a relationship with Cynthia. The lines exchanged between Birdboot and Felicity are presented both as theatrical, as they are almost identical with or to the same effect as the ones already exchanged between Simon and Felicity, and (more) real, as they refer to a (more) real event.

The same kind of humorous double-meaning dialogues exchanged between Birdboot and Mrs. Drudge, on the one hand, and between Birdboot and Cynthia, on the other, are reiterations of the similar dialogues between Simon and Mrs. Drudge, and Simon and Cynthia:

BIRDBOOT (*wildly*): I can't stay for a game of *cards*!
MRS. DRUDGE: Oh, Lady Muldoon *will* be disappointed.
BIRDBOOT: You mean…you mean, she wants to meet me…?
MRS. DRUDGE: Oh yes, sir, I just told her and it put her in quite a tizzy.
BIRDBOOT: Really? […] quite a tizzy, you say? (Hound 34)

More or less the same speeches were uttered earlier while Simon was talking to the char:

> SIMON: I don't think I can stay.
> MRS. DRUDGE: Oh, Lady Muldoon *will* be disappointed.
> SIMON: Does she know I'm here?
> MRS. DRUDGE: Oh yes, sir, I just told her and it put her in quite a tizzy.
> SIMON: Really? […] Quite a tizzy, you say […] (Hound 17)

A short while later confronting Cynthia, Birdboot exclaims:

> BIRDBOOT: I am not ashamed to proclaim nightly my love for you! […]
> CYNTHIA: But darling, this is madness!
> BIRDBOOT: Yes! I am mad with love.
> CYNTHIA: Please!—remember where we are!
> BIRDBOOT: I don't care! Let them think what they like, I love you!
> CYNTHIA: Don't—I love Albert!
> BIRDBOOT: He's dead. (*Shaking her*.) Do you understand me—Albert's dead! (Hound 34-35)

Almost the same lines were exchanged between Simon and Cynthia in the first act of the whodunit:

> SIMON: We have nothing to be ashamed of!
> CYNTHIA: But darling, this is madness!
> SIMON: Yes!—I am mad with love for you.
> CYNTHIA: Please—remember where we are!
> SIMON: Cynthia, I love you!
> CYNTHIA: Don't—I love Albert!
> SIMON: He's dead. (*Shaking her*.) Do you understand me—Albert's dead! (Hound 18)

Stoppard's mockery of 'the outsider' character is manifested in Birdboot's repetition of Simon's lines while they can be taken both theatrically and in a (more) real plane.

Birdboot's engagement in the thriller as Simon, 'the outsider', turns to a hilarious farce when he plays the card game already played by Simon in the first act of the whodunit:

BIRDBOOT (*standing up and throwing down his cards*): And I call your bluff!
CYNTHIA: Well done, Simon!
[…]
BIRDBOOT (*triumphant, leaping to his feet*): And I call your bluff!
CYNTHIA (*imperturbably*): I meld.
FELICITY: I huff.
MAGNUS: I ruff.
BIRDBOOT: I bluff.
CYNTHIA: Twist.
FELICITY: Bust.
MAGNUS: Check.
BIRDBOOT: Snap.
CYNTHIA: How's that?
FELICITY: Not out.
MAGNUS: Double top.
BIRDBOOT: Bingo.
CYNTHIA: No! Simon—your luck's in tonight. (Hound 37-8)

From a visual point of view, it seems they are playing a card game but what they utter are words and phrases commonly used in a variety of games including draughts, bridge, poker, pontoon, chess, American football, tennis, darts, bingo, etc. The humour of this scene, deriving mainly from the contradiction between the visual performance of the actors and what they say, is still enhanced as Birdboot always wins, just as Simon won earlier, and energetically displays his enjoyment. What Stoppard intends to deride beneath Birdboot's hilarious card game is the conventions of crime fictions. The stock 'outsider', no matter what sort of character he is or what he says, ends up with a predictable result in the conventional card game. Stoppard, on the other hand, mockingly parodies the cliché card games played typically in crime fictions, especially in country-house crime presented best by some of Agatha Christie's works.

Visual humour is another aspect of Stoppard's presentation of Birdboot as the generic 'outsider' character. One of its most hilarious instances can be seen when Birdboot tries to avoid being hit by Magnus, the wheelchair-ridden

half brother of Lady Muldoon. In his engagement in the inner play, Birdboot, who watched earlier how Simon was hit by Magnus's wheelchair in the second act of the thriller, "*prudently keeps out of the chair's former path but it enters from the next wing down and knocks him flying*" (Hound 35). Stoppard mocks the predictability of 'the outsider' role in this extreme instance. He bombastically and funnily insinuates that whatever the actor playing the conventional role does to trespass the boundaries of his cliché role, he cannot alter his conventionally doomed destiny because there is absolutely no room for any kind of change in the well worn-out convention.

The other characters of the whodunit, Cynthia and Felicity, are also parodies of their generic counterpart characters although they more often than not appear in country-house crime fictions. Mrs. Drudge is also a humorous character used by Stoppard to parody a variety of generic conventions. Cynthia is a funny personification of the 'vivacious hostess\widow', and Felicity is a humorous reproduction of the stereotypical trim-buttocked artless young 'guest'.

Mrs. Drudge is a comic character who is used by Stoppard to poke fun at a variety of crime conventions. Coincidence as used commonly in crime fictions is one of the generic conventions presented humorously via Mrs. Drudge. When she enters the stage, "*she heads straight for the radio*" and turns it on to listen to its interrupted "programme for a special police message" (Hound 8-9). Tidying the room after the police message, she heads for the phone. For some seconds she dusts "*it with an intense concentration*" displaying vividly that she is "*waiting for it to*" ring and then it rings (Hound 11). The use of chance and coincidence to such an unbelievable extent, in addition to the maid's emphasis on it by her waiting for the radio message and phone ringing, humorously reveals the thriller's unrealistic reliance on them. The chance and coincidence used here are funnily pointing to their implausible generic applications, including the conventional coincidence that when the radio is turned on it is right at the critical moment of interrupting its programme to announce an important police report. Besides, they are intended to picture the

maid's performance amateurishly and awkwardly. Later in the thriller, Mrs. Drudge's ever-presence to carefully overhear the actors' remarks about Simon underlines Stoppard's mockery of the generic chance and coincidence (Hound 41-2).

The other convention staged humorously via Mrs. Drudge is the heavy reliance of crime fictions on dialogues and direct presentations by which the generic exposition, still another convention, is parodied. These lead to her being the fictional playwright's walking stage direction as it was mentioned earlier. Suspense, an indispensable ingredient of the genre, is yet the other generic convention which Mrs. Drudge's dialogues create both awkwardly and humorously. As an instance, answering the wrong-number dialler early in the thriller while nothing important has happened, the maid irrelevantly alarms the audience saying, "this is all very mysterious and I'm sure it's leading up to something" (Hound 11). A convincing creation of suspense is an elaborate task. It necessitates a gradual process which relies more heavily on indirect presentation than direct assertion. Stoppard's lazy crime playwright, however, resorts to presenting suspense superficially and awkwardly through the maid. The created suspense is as unconvincing as it is funny.

In addition to her being funny while parodying the stock conventions of the genre, Mrs. Drudge proves her comicality in her speeches, too. Her misunderstandings picture her as a silly char and her metaphors and similes are sometimes so bombastic that they become hilarious in the context they are uttered. While she talks with Simon about the weather condition, the surprised 'uninvited guest' remarks:

> SIMON: I say, it's wonderful how you country people really know weather.
> MRS. DRUDGE (*suspiciously*): Know whether what?
> (Hound 12)

The maid's failure to understand Simon's intended meaning reveals Stoppard's intention to picture her comically. Her meaningless metaphors and similes are used to the same effect. When talking with Simon about the weather, she says:

> MRS. DRUDGE: the fog is very treacherous around here—it rolls off the sea without warning, shrouding the cliffs in a deadly mantle of blind man's buff. (Hound 12)

Later she reiterates her metaphor when she talks with Lady Muldoon:

> CYNTHIA: Yes, what is it, Mrs. Drudge?
> MRS. DRUDGE: Should I close the windows, my lady? The fog is beginning to roll off the sea like a deadly—
> CYNTHIA: Yes, you'd better. (Hound 19)

As Stephen Hu notices, the charwoman's ridiculously bombastic "comparisons are typically so offensive that other characters interrupt" (68).

Cynthia, the generic 'vivacious hostess', is also pictured humorously in *The Real Inspector Hound*. She displays both visual and verbal humour in her assigned role. In her first appearance in the whodunit, Cynthia who has been playing tennis with Felicity and is informed that Simon is waiting for her, enters "*through French windows*" (Hound 18). Her carrying a tennis racket emphasizes her coming from a tennis game but quite discordant to the already laid situation, "*she wears a cocktail dress*" and "*is formally coiffured*" (Hound 18). Stoppard here parodies "the amateurish timing of events" because appearing "directly from tennis game", Cynthia could not have had "any opportunity to have arranged for cocktail dress and impeccable hairdo that she wears" (Hu 65). The humorous discrepancy between Cynthia's formal clothing and her carrying a tennis racket, however, points to Stoppard's other intention, which is portraying Cynthia comically, too. The hilarity of Cynthia's appearance increases when it is compared to Felicity's first entrance –when Felicity enters a few moments before Cynthia, she is carrying a racket and is wearing "a pretty tennis outfit" (Hound 16).

Verbal humour is derived from Cynthia's speech when she fails to understand that Inspector Hound is a man not a hound. In spite of the other actors' chaotic attempts to explain it to her when Mrs. Drudge announces Inspector Hound's entrance, Cynthia asks surprisedly "A *police* dog?" (Hound 26). Her misunderstanding of Inspector Hound's request is also used to heighten the comedy:

> HOUND: Please, Lady Cynthia, we are all in this together. I must ask you to put yourself completely in my hands.
> CYNTHIA: Don't, Inspector. I love Albert.
> HOUND: I don't think you quite grasp my meaning.
> (Hound 28)

Her remark becomes more humorous when it is recalled that earlier she addressed similar sentences to both Simon and Magnus (18, 20). "Her being accustomed to repeating a standard defensive line to would-be suitors" increases the humour derived from her literal understanding of Inspector Hound's request (Hu 66).

Felicity, who displays the generic 'trim-buttocked artless young girl' – as Moon also observes in his comment (Hound 23)- is the other stereotypical character parodied in *The Real Inspector Hound*. Stoppard assigns to her a redundant sentence and he sketches her at least amusingly in the repetition of the whodunit. Before she appears for the first time in the play, a tennis ball is thrown into the house and Felicity follows it. Then "*calling behind her*", she shouts "Out!" (Hound 16). Her remark presupposes that her addressee, Cynthia, has not seen the ball bouncing out of the tennis court while it must have been Cynthia herself who has shot it out of the court. Felicity's remark is thus redundant and is awkwardly used by the fictional playwright to announce her entrance.

Once it is established that Felicity and Birdboot have had a kind of love relationship and that Birdboot wants "to call it off", the thriller repeats the scene while Birdboot steps into it as an actor, unintentionally taking Simon's

already played role. While Felicity sticks to her assigned lines, the double import of her dialogues with Birdboot is both witty and humorous:

> FELICITY: What are you doing here?!
> BIRDBOOT: Well, I…
> FELICITY: Honestly, darling, you really are extraordinary—
> BIRDBOOT: Yes, well, here I am. (*He looks round sheepishly*.)
> FELICITY: You must have been desperate to see me—I mean, I'm flattered, but couldn't it wait till I got back?
> BIRDBOOT: No, no, you've got it all wrong—
> FELICITY: What is it?
> BIRDBOOT: And about last night-perhaps I gave you the wrong impression-got carried away a bit, perhaps—
> FELICITY (*stiffly*): What are you trying to say?
> BIRDBOOT: I want to call it off.
> FELICITY: I see.
> […]
> FELICITY: You philandering coward!
> BIRDBOOT: I'm sorry-but I want you to know that I meant those things I said-oh yes-shows brilliant promise-I shall say so—
> FELICITY: I'll kill you for this, Simon Gascoyne! (Hound 33)

Although Felicity is 'really' amazed to see Birdboot on the stage, she carries on her role. Her theatrical lines are entertainingly presented as if she used them in a (more) real manner. In her theatrical role, however, she is simply repeating her previous dialogue.

Through his characters Stoppard parodies the stock generic concept of red herring, too. While crime fictions typically tend to offer one of their characters –usually 'the outsider'- as a red herring, in order to complicate the mystery behind the committed crime and mislead their addressees, the comic whodunit in *The Real Inspector Hound* exaggerates this generic convention by presenting almost all the characters as red herrings. Stoppard also has his fun with the conventional red herring of crime fictions by making his critics talk about it in a comic misunderstanding:

> MOON: Felicity!—she's the one.
> BIRDBOOT: Nonsense—red herring.

MOON: I mean, it was her!
BIRDBOOT (*exasperated*): *What* was?
MOON: That lady I saw you with last night! (Hound 17)

Turning the critics' observations about a red herring to a farcical misunderstanding underlines and foreshadows the laughter poked at the hackneyed concept.

Simon is the first red herring in the thriller. His threatening remarks – that he would kill anyone coming between him and Cynthia- and his over-acted suspicious behaviour right at the time he appears for the first time, which is humorous itself, are intended to depict him as a suspect (Hound 19, 9). When he is shot, the thriller reveals that the audience was deceived and Simon has been a red herring. When Birdboot steps into the thriller and is taken as Simon he is actually presented as a suspect who turns to a red herring when he is killed; however, his being a suspect and then a red herring are amusingly pictured in a more real plane than those of Simon's.

In the repetition of the thriller Moon, who is now taken as Inspector Hound, is informed by Mrs. Drudge that Cynthia threatened Simon that she would kill him (Hound 41). The suspect of the second theatrical crime, murdering Simon, and the second (more) real crime, murdering Birdboot, now becomes Cynthia who is instantly warned by Moon "I must warn you, Lady Muldoon that anything you say—"(Hound 42). Moon has not yet finished his cliché sentence –that is, 'anything you say will be used against you in the court'- when Cynthia denies having anything to do with murdering Simon. Mrs. Drudge then relates that she has heard Felicity threatening Simon (Hound 42). While Cynthia turns out to be the next red herring, Felicity becomes the new suspect. Comically enough, Moon\Inspector Hound now explains Felicity's motives for killing Simon in a ridiculous parody of the generic sleuth who explains the mystery of a crime in a story-telling manner (Hound 42-3). In a flash Magnus turns Felicity the suspect to Felicity the red herring by directing suspicion to Moon. As the audience knows and he himself funnily assures the actors in a childish way, by saying "but I didn't kill—I'm almost sure I— […] I

only dreamed…sometimes I dreamed—" (Hound 43), Moon is not the culprit. When the real culprit unmasks himself, Moon the suspect becomes Moon the red herring. Stoppard thus mocks the generic 'red herring' not only by exaggeratingly introducing six of them but also by swiftly and unconvincingly turning them from suspects to red herrings. Time and again Mrs. Drudge's overhearing of the actors' remarks is taken to be the only evidence to turn the innocent actors to suspects. The generic 'overhearing' convention is thus another parodied tradition of crime fictions as it is humorously exaggerated by the maid's ever-presence to carefully overhear the actors.

Stoppard's *The Real Inspector Hound* thus uses the stereotypical characters of crime fictions and, at the same time, ridicules them. Through his comical characters, he also pokes fun at some other conventions of the genre. The major generic stock characters parodied in his play are the 'murdered', the 'sleuth', and the 'outsider'. The other characters of Stoppard's farcical thriller are also parodies of their generic counterparts although they are more often detectable in that kind of crime usually referred to as country-house or cosy crime fiction. Cynthia humorously represents the 'attractive hostess\widow', and Felicity Cunningham is an amusing personification of the 'artless young girl'.

4.2.3 Other Conventions

In his *The Real Inspector Hound*, Stoppard not only parodies the stereotypical plot and characters of crime fictions but also makes use of a variety of the conventions of the genre comically. Most of these conventions – such as heavy reliance on suspense, mystery, surprise, improbability, chance, coincidence, red herring, and overhearing- were scrutinized earlier. The other major generic conventions parodied in Stoppard's farcical thriller are radio police messages and settings.

As noted earlier, a formulaic convention in typical crime fictions, specifically country-house ones, is the use of radio police bulletin to report a crime and\or to announce that a criminal is on the loose. Stoppard's whodunit pokes fun at this convention by using the radio three times, which is turned on only to catch police messages which are always improbably interrupting the radio's usual programs. First Mrs. Drudge switches the radio on "*without preamble*", then Simon feels "*a strange impulse*" to turn it on, and finally Felicity "*jumps to her feet in impatience*" to turn the radio on (Hound 9, 14, 25). The police messages are presented humorously not only because of the way the actors turn on the radio or that every time it is switched on, it interrupts its programs in an improbable and implausible manner to broadcast a police report –which indicates Stoppard's parody of the generic coincidence- but also because the reports themselves are ludicrous. The first police report describes the madman on the loose:

> The man is wearing a darkish suit with a lightish shirt. He is of medium height and built and youngish. Anyone seeing a man answering to this description and acting suspiciously, is advised to phone the nearest police station. (Hound 9)

The announced physical appearance and clothing of the madman is so much like the other members of society that most of young men can answer to that description. The humour derived from the police bulletin is intensified in the second police message when it informs that the searching police "are combing the swamps with loud-hailers, shouting, "Don't be a madman, give yourself up" (Hound 14). The childish absurdity of the police request –to ask a madman not to be mad- underlines the comicality of the radio report.

As explained earlier, a secluded country house, usually an English manor house, is a conventional setting in some crime fictions, especially country-house ones. Stoppard makes comic use of this generic convention in his *The Real Inspector Hound*, too. To quote Mrs. Drudge's speech, Muldoon Manor, where the inner play takes place, is an old English "Queen Ann House"

which is "cut off from the world" because of "the topographical quirk in the local strata whereby there are no roads leading from the Manor, though there *are* ways of getting *to* it, weather allowing" (Hound 13, 11, 12). The weather, however, does not allow it at the critical moment of the play because "The fog is very treacherous around" there (Hound 12). Although the setting of place and the atmospheric conditions are the generic ones, Stoppard presents them hilariously by making the maid irrelevantly talk about them as she tells an abundance of information to a wrong-number dialler and then to Simon, the stranger who has just entered the house through the window.

The traditional telephone-cut is also applied mockingly in Stoppard's whodunit. The prop phone rings no fewer than four times –three times during the first two acts of the thriller. When Inspector Hound wants to use it, however, he announces that the line is cut. In order to mock this formulaic convention, Stoppard dramatizes the whole situation comically. After discovering the corpse which nobody can identify, the dialogue between Cynthia and Inspector Hound continues:

> CYNTHIA: But what are we going to do?
> HOUND (*snatching the phone*): I'll phone the police!
> CYNTHIA: But you are the police!
> HOUND: Thank God I'm here—the lines have been cut!
> CYNTHIA: You mean—?
> HOUND: Yes!—we're on our own, cut off from the world and in grave danger. (Hound 30)

Forgetting that he has introduced himself as the representative of the police, Inspector Hound betrays himself by a funny mistake while the unconvincing situation is created to let the fictional playwright use the convention of cut-lines. The situation, as Inspector Hound verifies, "is becoming an utter shambles" presenting to the audience a parody of the generic automated convention (Hound 30).

The Real Inspector Hound is thus Stoppard's attempt to parody the hackneyed genre of crime fiction in general and its country-house\cosy kind, in

particular. Through his farcical presentation of the generic formulaic plot and characters of whodunits, Stoppard derides them and humorously draws his audience's attention to their superficiality and their lack of originality. He pokes laughter at a wide variety of the stock conventions of the genre, too.

4.3 Parody of Agatha Christie's *The Mousetrap*

Stoppard creates a multilayer parody in his *The Real Inspector Hound*. Although the main focus of the play is on parodying critics and the crime genre, it does not fail to poke fun at some specific texts. A few of these works, suggested by different critics, can be enumerated as some of Agatha Christie's country-house thrillers including *The Mousetrap*, Arthur Conan Doyle's *The Unexpected Guest* and his *The Hound of Baskervilles*, Ludwig Tieck's *Puss-in-Boots*, Pirandello's trilogy of theatre plays, and Joe Orton's *Loot* and his *What the Butler Saw*. Some critics have also found parodies of *Hamlet*, with its 'Mousetrap', and Stoppard's own *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern Are Dead* in Stoppard's play. The specific texts which can be considered as the original subjects of parody in Stoppard's play are so various that Katherine E. Kelly prefers to highlight its genre parody so much that she almost tends to disregard the play's minor focus on parodying specific works (Kelly 1994: 82).

While the variety of the suggested original texts of the parody in *The Real Inspector Hound* seems confusing[1], there seems to be a kind of general agreement among commentators that Agatha Christie's works provide a main subject of parody in Stoppard's play. Kelly notes that "while all sense the Christie behind Hound, none agree on exactly which Christie is being parodied" (1994: 82). Although Kelly's observation might be true, there are many critics

[1] Amusingly, one of the reasons why a variety of texts are suggested as the original subject of parody in Stoppard's play is that it parodies a stock genre. Since crime fictions typically follow some formulaic conventions and these conventions are parodied in the play, one way or the other, it can display a parody of all the works which make use of them.

who agree that at least Christie's *The Mousetrap* is one of the major subjects of parody in Stoppard's play (Jenkins 1989: 82, Billington 67, Gabbard 67, Whitaker 113). This, however, does not mean that Stoppard's specific parody is restricted to Christie's *The Mousetrap*. It rather means that the play parodies a variety of specific works both written by Christie and other writers but the parody of *The Mousetrap* seems to be more systematically applied and it is more easily recognizable.

Looked at from another perspective, Stoppard might have had a good reason to parody Christie's *The Mousetrap*. Besides its melodramatic conventionality, Christie's play can boast holding a world record for its longest initial run in the world[1]. In 1947, the play was originally written as a short radio play named *Three Blind Mice*, and it was a birthday gift for Queen Mary. Later Christie turned it into a fiction while working on a stage version of the same plot. She had great hopes for the stage play so she asked for suppressing the publication of its fiction version in England as long as it ran as a play in London –it is the reason why the fiction appears only in American publications.

The parody of Christie's *The Mousetrap* in Stoppard's play can be traced in its plot and some of its conventional characters, as well as some other stock conventions used in it. While parodying the plot of *The Mousetrap* with its surprise ending and its circularity, Stoppard has been careful not to follow Christies' plot exactly. Stoppard's clever parody intends in a way not to let the producers of Christie's play and its copyright holders complain publicly that the surprise twist of Christie's play was copied or revealed; a surprise ending which has ever since been asked not to be revealed by the play's audience although

[1] Premiered at the Ambassadors Theatre in London on 25 November 1952, ever since the play has been produced in London –as of 2008 its performances exceed 23000 ones (Wikipedia, the Free Encyclopedia). For more information about its performances consult Appendix D.

after so many performances of the play, it is now a rather comic cliché delivered by the actors at the end of its performance[1].

A short glance at the plot of *The Mousetrap* can reveal how far *The Real Inspector Hound* is intended to parody Christie's work. Molly and Giles Davis have just inherited Monkswell Manor and decide to turn it into a guest house by the same name. Before the arrival of the first guests, a radio news report announces that a woman has been murdered in London. The guests, Christopher Wren, Mrs. Boyle, and Major Metcalf, then arrive one by one. During the night, Mr. Paravicini who has had a car crash in the snow checks in unexpectedly. The police call and Molly learns that Detective Sergeant Trotter will soon arrive. In spite of the snow-covered impassable roads, he manages to get to the guest house. When he arrives he has his skies on and it explains how he has been able to reach there. He warns that the murderer might come soon or might be among the people in the guest house. Mrs. Boyle soon is murdered and Detective Sergeant Trotter, who wants to find out who killed her, asks all the characters to repeat what they were doing when Mrs. Boyle was killed; however, he asks each character to repeat another one's actions. Doing what Mr. Paravicini has been doing –that is, playing the piano- Molly is left alone in a room. Detective Sergeant Trotter enters the room and discloses that he is the criminal in guise. He wants to murder Molly when Major Metcalf arrests him unmasking himself as Inspector Tanner, the real police officer.

The plot of the whodunit in *The Real Inspector Hound* is more or less a comic imitation of the plot of *The Mousetrap*. Stoppard's thriller commences by mocking Christie's radio report of the criminal on the loose by having Mrs. Drudge funnily turn the radio on (Hound 9). Stoppard pokes fun at Christie's application of the radio message by having the maid enter the stage and head straight for the radio. The police report on the radio, which interrupts the ongoing program and is broadcast exactly when the radio is turned on,

[1] For the same reason the text used in this study is the fiction version of *The Mousetrap*. It is noteworthy that, in regard to the subject of this study, there is not much difference between the play version and fiction version of Christie's work.

humorously points to the unrealistic nature of the police bulletin broadcast in *The Mousetrap*. From the view point of its contents, the police warning parodies the police warning read by Molly: "the man the police are anxious to interview was wearing a dark overcoat and a light Homburg hat, was of medium height and wore a woollen scarf" (Mousetrap 20-21). The police description is so general that most of the men can answer to the description. This is verified by Christopher Wren who comments laughingly "he looks just like everybody else" (21). Stoppard's police message, likewise, describes its madman on the loose as "wearing a darkish suit with a lightish shirt" who "is of medium height and built and youngish" (Hound 9).

The plot of Stoppard's thriller then introduces Simon Gascoyne, 'the unexpected guest'. In a way, he is a parody of his counterpart character in *The Mousetrap*, Mr. Paravicini, who turns up out of the blue –or rather white, as the roads are snow-covered and impassable. Simon pokes laughter at his parodied role by acting suspiciously right from the beginning of Stoppard's whodunit (Hound 9). The other dimension of his humorous portrayal is his unjustified vanishing away through the second act of the thriller only to appear later and be murdered (Hound 30).

After introducing the suspicious outsider, Christie's plot thickens by presenting Detective Sergeant Trotter who has come to protect the characters against a possible danger (Mousetrap 39). Although the roads are impassable because of the heavy snowfall, he manages to get himself to Monkswell Manor by skiing and his arrival attire, having his skis on, confirms that. The plot of Stoppard's thriller follows almost the same pattern by introducing Inspector Hound. His arrival, just like that of his counterpart's, is surprising because the fog has already made the surrounding swamps of Muldoon Manor impassable. Inspector Hound's hilarious arrival reveals how he has been able to do the impossible job: "*on his feet are his swamp boots. These are two inflatable—and inflated—pontoons with flat bottom about two feet across. He carries a foghorn*" (Hound 16). Like his original character he tries to protect the characters from a potential danger, yet he fails and someone is murdered. While

Christie presents her Detective Trotter as the real murderer, Stoppard does not let his audience know who kills Simon or who really Inspector Hound is. Stoppard thus makes fun of what Christie's detective does by portraying his Inspector Hound unconvincingly and, at the same time, mocks his very character.

Christie's plot then goes on with Detective Trotter asking the characters to repeat what they have been doing when the second murder was committed (Mousetrap 74). The characters claim to have done the same actions but the doers of the actions have changed. Stoppard's thriller displays the same course of actions however humorously. After the second act of the thriller, it repeats from the first act but the reason for the repetition is not clear for the audience. The unconvincing and unjustified circularity of Stoppard's play, with its blurring the line between reality and theatre, in a way derides the circularity and repeated actions of *The Mousetrap*. Almost like Christie's plot, in the repetition of Stoppard's thriller, the same actions of two actors –that is, Simon and Inspector Hound- are reiterated by two other characters. The humour of Stoppard's repeated plot mainly derives from having Birdboot and Moon, two theatre audience\critics from a (more) real plane of reality, recapitulate what Simon and Inspector Hound have already delivered and done in the thriller.

The denouement of *The Mousetrap* turns out to have a surprise ending when Major Metcalf unmasks himself as the real police officer, Inspector Tanner, and arrests the criminal, who has been in the guise of Detective Sergeant Trotter. Order then is restored after the chaos created by the lunatic criminal. *The Real Inspector Hound* follows the same denouement but turns it to a hilarious scene. Major Magnus unmasks himself as the real police agent. Humour derives from Stoppard's denouement as Major Magnus, now the Real Inspector Hound, unmasks himself again. He introduces himself as Albert, Cynthia's lost husband, as well. Right at this time Moon, who is now the fake Inspector Hound, recognizes Magnus as Puckeridge, his own stand-in critic in the (more) real world. Magnus-the real Inspector Hound-Albert-Puckeridge-the real criminal shoots Moon\fake Inspector Hound. Instead of the lost order being

restored a new order is formed where the real policeman is the real culprit and gets away with his crimes and where, as the critic Moon had dreamed before, the stand-ins take the places of their superiors by murdering them.

Stoppard thus parodies the main threads of the plot of Christie's *The Mousetrap*. The most obvious parts of this parody are the circularity of the plot of Stoppard's thriller, which parodies the same kind of repetition in Christie's plot, and its denouement intended to ridicule the surprise ending, along with the unmasking of the real policeman.

The main characters of Stoppard's thriller are in a way parodies of their counterpart characters in Christie's work. Inspector Hound and Major Magnus are intended to ridicule Detective Trotter and Major Metcalf, respectively. Simon Gascoyne parodies Mr. Paravicini although, compared to Inspector Hound and Major Magnus, his being parodic is less obvious.

Stoppard's Inspector Hound displays some of the characteristics whose original character, Detective Sergeant Trotter, presents in *The Mousetrap*. Besides his arrival in ridicules attire, which parodies Trotter's arrival and was mentioned earlier, Inspector Hound's reason for being in Muldoon Manor, just like his counterpart's, is to protect the household from a possible danger. He insinuates this when he says to Cynthia "You never know, there might have been a serious crime" (Hound 27). The serious situation turns to a comic one when Cynthia asks "Drink?" and Inspector Hound misunderstands her, declaring "more serious than that, even" (27). Cynthia then makes it clear that she means if the police agent will drink something before he leaves. Inspector Hound's reason for being in the manor is presented more comically when he is portrayed leaving because of not being able to find any crime\trouble in the manor. Also in this respect, Stoppard's Inspector Hound parodies Christie's Detective Trotter whose reason for being in Monkswell Manor is, as he himself declares, "a matter of police protection" (Mousetrap 41). As Christie's detective fails to protect the household, Inspector Hound is unsuccessful in preventing a second crime.

Christie's sleuth is indeed the very criminal who commits the second murder. Unlike this, while Stoppard's play introduces Major Magnus as the Real Inspector Hound, it does not uncover who actually Inspector Hound is. His unjustified role in the thriller, especially when his role is repeated by Moon, highlights his major difference from Christie's detective and pokes fun at him.

Christie's Major Metcalf is a guest in Monkswell Manor and at the end unmasks himself as the real police inspector. Stoppard's Major Magnus is likewise a guest in the manor and at the end unmasks himself as the real police representative. Stoppard, however, portrays his Major hilariously by representing him hitting the actors while he rides on his wheelchair (Hound 19, 35-6) and by unmasking him as the Real Inspector Hound, Albert, Puckeridge, and the criminal\madman on the loose. Major Magnus thus presents Christie's Major Metcalf in a bombastically implausible manner in order to evoke laughter at the original character.

The generic 'suspicious outsider', Mr. Paravicini, is yet another Christie character who is personified comically in Stoppard's whodunit. His role is in a way taken over by Simon Gascoyne; however, the similarities between Simon and Mr. Paravicini are mainly confined to their generic roles. In other words, he is mainly a parody of his generic character and since *The Mousetrap* displays that generic role, to a certain extent, he can be considered as a parody of his generic counterpart character in Christie's thriller.

Besides parodying the plot and some of the characters of *The Mousetrap*, *The Real Inspector Hound* parodies the conventional settings applied by Christie. Stoppard's thriller, just like Christie's, happens in a manor secluded from the outside world because of some atmospheric conditions. Stoppard, however, derides Christie's stereotypical settings by presenting them humorously.

The Mousetrap is set in a country house, Monkswell Manor, just turned to a guest house while it is heavily snowing. The heavy snow fall soon secludes the manor from the outside world. Stoppard's whodunit likewise happens in a

manor, Muldoon Manor, secluded from the outside world by treacherous swamps and foggy weather:

> MRS. DRUDGE (*into phone*): Hello, the drawing-room of Lady Muldoon's country residence one morning in early spring?...He*llo*!—the draw—Who? Who did you wish to speak to? I'm afraid there is no one of that name here […] we, that is Lady Muldoon and her houseguests, are here cut off from the world, including Magnus, the wheelchair-ridden half-brother of her ladyship's husband Lord Albert Muldoon who ten years ago went out for a walk on the cliffs and was never seen again—and all alone, for they had no children. (Hound 11)

Mrs. Drudge is the maid of the manor who starts Stoppard's thriller by first turning the radio on and then dusting the telephone "*with intense concentration*" showing that she is waiting for it to ring. When it rings she pours out the quoted information which is humorous in that it is implausibly excessive and is irrelevantly told to a wrong-number dialler. In her following metaphors and similes, the char humorously defines the atmospheric condition and topographical location of the manor: "the topographical quirk in the local strata whereby there are no roads leading from the Manor, though there *are* ways of getting *to* it, weather allowing" (Hound 12). The maid's irrelevant information is comically used to blatantly inform the audience about the settings of place and time. Stoppard thus ridicules Christie's settings by presenting them ludicrously at the beginning of his thriller via the char.

The seclusion of Muldoon Manor is further emphasized by the telephone-line cut which is a parody of the same convention used in *The Mousetrap*. When Detective Sergeant Trotter wants to use the phone to "report to [his] Superintendent Hogben", he is informed by Molly that the telephone is dead (Mousetrap 52). To stress its conventionality, Stoppard's thriller makes fun of this situation:

> HOUND: This case is becoming an utter shambles.
> CYNTHIA: But what are we going to do?

> HOUND (*snatching the phone*): I'll phone the police!
> CYNTHIA: But you are the police!
> HOUND: Thank God I'm here—the lines have been cut!
> (Hound 30)

Parodying Detective Trotter, Inspector Hound wants to call the police but he wants to call because he has discovered a corpse and does not know what to do with it. Besides, Stoppard mocks the convention of cut-off telephone lines.

The Real Inspector Hound, thus, can be viewed as a parody of Agatha Christie's *The Mousetrap*. Stoppard's play pokes fun at the circular plot of Christie's work as well as its denouement with a surprising twist. The major characters of Stoppard's play are, in a way, parodies of their counterpart cliché characters in *The Mousetrap*. Besides, Stoppard's play both uses and makes fun of some other hackneyed conventions which are presented in Christie's work.

In sum, *The Real Inspector Hound* is a play with a variety of parodies. It parodies the audience of thrillers through the comic portrayal of Moon and Birdboot as the representatives of the spectators of the play. Both Moon and Birdboot parody critics with their critical approaches and their jargon. On the other hand, the thriller which is staged in *The Real Inspector Hound* parodies the genre of crime fiction by poking laughter at a variety of its stock conventions, including plot, characters, and settings. At the same time, Stoppard's thriller can be viewed as a parody of Agatha Christie's *The Mousetrap* since it ridiculously presents the plot, major characters, and some other stereotypical conventions of Christie's work.

CHAPTER 5

DOGG'S HAMLET, CAHOOT'S MACBETH

Tom Stoppard wrote *Dogg's Hamlet, Cahoot's Macbeth* in 1979. The play actually sprang out of three earlier works: *Dogg's Our Pet, The Fifteen-Minute Dogg's Troup Hamlet,* and *Cahoot's Macbeth*. Stoppard put down *Dogg's Our Pet* as an opening ceremony for the Inter-Action's Almost Free Theatre in Rupert Street, Soho district of London, in 1971 and it was premiered there in December of that year. In the 'Author's Note' of *Ten of the Best British Short Plays*, about the title of this short play, Stoppard exclaims: "The title is an anagram for Dogg's Troup, a group of actors operating under the umbrella of Inter-Action, whose guiding spirit is Ed Berman, sometimes known as Professor Dogg"(80).

The Fifteen-Minute Dogg's Troup Hamlet was also a separate piece. Originally Stoppard wrote –or rather edited- it for seven actors to perform it in Inter-Action's Fun Art Bus, a double-decker play bus was then used as a performance space. According to Ed Berman in his preface, 'How Long is an Ephemeron?', to *Ten of the Best British Short Plays*: "we [Berman and Stoppard] both coincidentally misplaced the script for four years" but in 1976, Dogg's Troup played it for the first time "on the grey parapets of the National Theatre" serving as Elsinore (x).

The first part of the diptych -*Dogg's Hamlet, Cahoot's Macbeth*- conflates the two playlets – i.e. *Dogg's Our Pet* and *The Fifteen-Minute Dogg's Troup Hamlet*- while it elaborates the first and barely changes the second one. The catalyst for joining the two playlets was yet another Berman project, BARC –the British American Repertory Company, composed of equity actors from both countries.

The second part of the diptych, which includes an abbreviated version of *Macbeth*, was inspired by the situation of artists in Czechoslovakia after Charter 77 and more immediately by a letter from Pavel Kohout in 1978 describing his Living-Room Theatre as a group of actors with one suitcase who performs *Macbeth* in private homes (Dogg's Hamlet 141-3).

On 21 May 1979, *Dogg's Hamlet, Cahoot's Macbeth* was first staged[1] by Ed Berman, whose pseudonym is Dogg[2] and to whom the first part of the play is dedicated, and his British American Repertory Company at the Arts Centre of the University of Warwick in Coventry. Before being staged in the United States, for a season the play was performed at the Collegiate Theatre in London on 30 July 1979. The play has enjoyed some short runs at the other British theatres, as well.

Dogg's Hamlet, Cahoot's Macbeth, as Stoppard affirms in the 'Introduction', is derived from the language games put forward in *Philosophical Investigations*[3]. The first part of the play –i.e. *Dogg's Hamlet*- dramatizes a school performance of *Hamlet* by a group of Dogg-speaking children; based on Wittgenstein's idea, Stoppard develops Dogg[4] as a language using English words with different, sometimes contrary, meanings.

Dogg's Hamlet begins with a game of catch between two schoolboys, Baker and Abel, whose conversations are all in Dogg language. Another schoolboy, Charlie, enters the game of catch and is harassed by Abel, who taunts him by taking the football. They trade insults in Dogg. The three boys sit down to eat lunch when suddenly Abel and Baker begin to exchange some lines

---

[1] For the first major productions of the play consult Appendix E.

[2] Ed Berman's pen name is Professor R. L. Dogg. Berman in his preface to *Ten of the Best British Short Plays* informs that library entries for his pen name will appear under the heading of 'doggerel'. This can be one of the reasons why Stoppard calls his invented language Dogg.

[3] It is written by Ludwig Josef Johann Wittgenstein (1889-1951), a Viennese student at Cambridge who worked under Bertrand Russell and later with G. E. Moore served on the Austrian's doctoral examination committee in 1929. Published posthumously in 1953, the work is indeed an attack on the philosopher's own major work, the *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus* put down in 1921 (Hu 177).

[4] For a list of Dogg words and their senses in English see Appendix F.

from *Hamlet*; it turns out to be their rehearsal for their school play, which is named 'Dogg's Hamlet'. English, to these boys, is a foreign language. A delivery truck arrives and its driver, Easy, only speaks English. He offends the headmaster, because a common English greeting is an insult in Dogg. After some confusing misunderstandings between Easy and the headmaster, Dogg, they start building a platform. Dogg positions Easy and the boys in a line from the offstage truck to the place onstage where the platform will be built. When Dogg says, 'plank', which means 'ready' in Dogg, the first piece of lumber is passed down the line. It happens to be a plank, so Easy thinks he has understood what is going on and he calls out 'plank' several times. After the first few planks, though, lumber in the shape of blocks, cubes, and slabs come. Easy becomes comically confused. As this crew builds the stage, the audience begins to see that some of the blocks in the back wall have letters on them. Easy has not noticed the letters and builds a wall that says "MATHS OLD EGG". When the schoolmaster sees this, he hits Easy and knocks him through the wall. When the wall is rebuilt, it says "MEG SHOT GLAD". Dogg knocks Easy through the wall again. As the wall is being rebuilt, the school ceremony commences. A lady comes forward to make a speech that sounds foul in English but is apparently a normal school speech in Dogg language. Dogg then awards a number of school trophies, all of them to a student named Fox Major.

In his language, Dogg announces that it is time for William Shakespeare's *Hamlet*. The rebuilt wall now reads "GOD SLAG THEM". Dogg gives Easy a dirty look from a distance and Easy obligingly hurls himself through the wall. As they rebuild the wall one last time, Easy and the schoolboys take turns venting insults about Dogg. As they do so, some elements of Dogg language creep into Easy's speech so that by the time the wall is rebuilt to say "DOGGS HAM LET", Easy is speaking Dogg. Following a prologue delivered by 'Shakespeare', the performance of *Hamlet* –or 'Dogg's Hamlet'-starts. The performance -"The 15-Minute Hamlet" as Stoppard calls it- is a version of *Hamlet* so condensed that it is now more comical than tragic. Mr. Dogg, Mrs. Dogg, and the students are the actors. Fox Major, as the best in

everything at school, plays Hamlet. Upon the conclusion of the acting, there is an even more condensed encore which performs *Hamlet* in a couple of minutes. The actors take their curtain call, and Easy begins to take down the stage by carrying a cube away, while thanking the audience in Dogg by saying "Cube".

The second part of the play –i.e. *Cahoot's Macbeth*- opens with dramatizing the first scene of the witches in *Macbeth*. The adult actors are playing the truncated *Macbeth* in a flat when an inspector from the police department enters the stage. The Inspector terrorizes the actors and the Hostess for acting without authority. He then takes a seat among the audience of the play to watch the performance. When the performance reaches the time that Macbeth is named King, the Inspector interrupts it seemingly thinking that the play is over. After asking the audience and the actors to leave the flat calmly, the Inspector leaves the flat. Nevertheless, the performance carries on and Easy, the lorry driver from *Dogg's Hamlet*, arrives announcing in Dogg language that he has deliveries from Leamington Spa. His arrival coincides with the dialogues between the first and the second Murderer in the performance of *Macbeth*. Unintentionally, he fills up the role of the third Murderer. He then is led offstage by the Hostess only to come back later and confuse the actors even more. The actors start to understand that he is speaking Dogg when the Inspector comes back. With his Dogg language, Easy comically confuses the Inspector, too. The Inspector stays onstage terrorizing the actors and trying to stop the performance while the actors shift to Dogg to perform the last Act of Shakespeare's tragedy. Using Easy's delivery of pieces of wood, the helpless Inspector and his two sidekicks build a wall across the proscenium to stop the performance; however, the performance reaches its end when the wall is complete. Repeating Shakespeare's line –"Double double toil and trouble"- Easy finishes the play showing that he has re-learnt English by saying "Well, it's been a funny sort of week. But I should be back by Tuesday."

Although Tom Stoppard's *Dogg's Hamlet, Cahoot's Macbeth*[1] illustrates a good deal of satire, the dramatist's application of parody is detectable throughout the play. Stoppard's application of parody in this play, however, is less vivid than his application of it in his *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern Are Dead*. Since the play yokes together two plays, each part of the diptych is scrutinized in a separate section in order to detect the author's application of parody in them. Generally speaking, *Dogg's Hamlet*, the first part of the play, displays some different parodies whose original subjects are mainly Wittgenstein's language game, English language, and Shakespeare's *Hamlet*. All of these parodies are in the main framework of the parody of school performances of Shakespeare in the western schools where students must take compulsory Shakespeare courses while they find that understanding his language is a difficult burden[2]. Dogg language is also used in the second part of the play –while the actors perform the last Act of *Macbeth* in it- but the main emphasis of its application there is to parody English language although, at the same time, it parodies Wittgenstein's language games, too.

Cahoot's Macbeth, the second part of the play, displays a parody of (Shakespeare) living-room performances under the menace of totalitarian regimes. In a way, it also parodies Shakespeare's *Macbeth*. Within the framework of its two main parodies, *Cahoot's Macbeth* exhibits some other parodies, as well. It parodies the very agent of repression in totalitarian countries as well as English language. The English language parody –in the form of Dogg language- is taken from the first part of the double-bill and it depends on Wittgenstein's theory which is parodied there; thus, first the parodic Dogg language and its relations with Wittgenstein's theory will be analysed with an emphasis on their detailed demonstrations in the first part of the play.

---

[1] There are some different published texts of the play with slight differences. The text used in this study appears in *Tom Stoppard, Plays One: The Real Inspector Hound and Other Entertainments* published by Faber and Faber, London :1996.

[2] The reason for parodying school performances of Shakespeare can be traced to his hatred of compulsory Shakespeare in western schools, too. Stoppard himself says that he left school because he had been "totally bored and alienated by every one from Shakespeare to Dickens" (Ambushes 53).

The parodies in *Dogg's Hamlet* and *Cahoot's Macbeth* are then examined, respectively.

5.1 Wittgenstein Language Game

In his 'Introduction' to the play, Stoppard notes that "*Dogg's Hamlet* derives from a section of Wittgenstein's philosophical investigations" and then tries to explain briefly the language game Wittgenstein proposes in his work (141). The first part of Wittgenstein's *Philosophical Investigations* contains 693 short passages which develop the idea Stoppard explains in his 'Introduction' and dramatizes in his *Dogg's Hamlet* (Hu 177).

The scenario of a foreigner trying to determine the correspondences between words and objects is in passage 20 in Wittgenstein's work. The philosopher imagines an imaginary 'primitive language' as the means of communication between a builder and his assistant:

> Let us imagine a language –meant to serve for communication between a builder A and an assistant B. A is building with building-stones: there are blocks, pillars, slabs and beams. B has to pass the stones, and that in the order in which A needs them. For this purpose they use a language consisting of the words "block", "pillar", "slab". A calls them out; -B brings the stone which he has learnt to bring at such-and-such a call. –Conceive this as a complete primitive language. (Philosophical Investigations qtd. in Kelly 1994: 129-130)

Wittgenstein's purpose of this example is to show the limitations of the theory of language learning developed by St Augustine in his *Confessions*, which suggests that a child acquires language when an adult points to an object and states its name. He believes that St Augustine's idea works "as if the child came into a strange country and did not understand the language of that country; that is, as if he already had a language, only not this one" (Philosophical Investigations qtd. in Brassell 236). The example of a team of builders serves to

demonstrate the miscellaneous theoretically possible meanings that their calls – such as 'block', 'slab', etc. - may possess for each of the interlocutors. In other words, there is the possibility of not having a one-to-one correspondence between a word and its sense as understood by various communicators, and yet communication may go along seemingly sound.

Dogg's Hamlet puts on stage a comic enactment of this part of Wittgenstein's theory and example. The play, in addition, comically advances the theory to embrace "the possibility that different groups of people might use the same words to mean fundamentally different things" (Kelly 1994: 130). In other words, Stoppard parodies both Wittgenstein's example and the situation in which misunderstanding arises between the interlocutors because of understanding different senses from the same words (Kelly 1994: 130). Developing Wittgenstein's idea, Stoppard introduces Dogg language which is a more elaborate language with a much larger vocabulary than Wittgenstein's example; the language that is linguistically the base language in *Dogg's Hamlet* and is the interrupting language in *Cahoot's Macbeth*.

The comic enactment of Wittgenstein's example can be seen in *Dogg's Hamlet* when Easy, the English speaking lorry driver, attempts to build a platform for the student production of *Hamlet*. Except for Easy, everybody – including the school children and staff speak Dogg; English for them is a foreign language from which they understand nothing. Building the platform with the aid of the students –Abel, Baker, and Charlie- who are in a line to pass pieces of wood to him, Easy calls for the pieces which are in shapes of planks, blocks, slabs, and cube; however, these words mean ready, next, okay/yes, and thanks/thank you in Dogg, respectively. Based on the plan which is given to Easy by the school master, Dogg, first Easy calls for planks –which means 'ready' for the Dogg-speaking children- and for a couple of times he receives them by sheer happy coincidence. When Dogg leaves, being sure everything is sound, Easy confidently calls for another plank. To his dismay, a block is thrown to him. Easy repeats:

EASY: …Plank!

(*A second block is thrown straight into* CHARLIE*'s arms.* CHARLIE *passes it to EASY who passes it back to* CHARLIE *who takes it upstage to join the first block on the floor*. EASY *shouts*.)

Plank!!!

(*A plank is thrown straight to him.* […] *He shouts*.)

Slab!

([…] *A slab is thrown in, caught by* BAKER, *passed to* CHARLIE, *passed to* EASY […] EASY *shouts*.)

[…] Slab!

(*Another block is thrown*, […])

Slab!

ABEL: (*Enters smiling*.) Slab?

EASY: Nit!

ABEL: Nit?

EASY: Git! Slab.

(ABEL *leaves and a moment later another block comes flying across to* EASY *who catches it* […].)

EASY: (*Off-stage*.) Useless.

ABEL: (*Politely, off-stage*.) Useless, git.

(*There is the sound of a slap and a sharp cry from* ABEL. […].) (Dogg's Hamlet 154-5)

Stoppard dramatizes Wittgenstein's example of the builders with some differences and to a different effect. In the example provided by the philosopher, the assistant of the builder knows in advance the order of the demanded pieces of stone. In Stoppard's enactment of the scenario, the assistants, children, do not know the order of the needed pieces of wood; they simply respond to the words they hear and, of course, the meanings they understand from them are far different from what the builder, Easy, intends. Based on a dramatic irony, the misunderstanding between the characters rises, creates confusion for the characters, and leads to insult, then to violence and physical abuse. The visual humour is augmented for the spectators on their finding out that the builders' communication goes along seemingly sound when Dogg is present and starts to collapse when he leaves.

The immediate subject of the parody in this scene, and the other scenes like this one, is the example put forward by Wittgenstein. Not only does Stoppard put before the spectators a live model of Wittgenstein's imaginary

situation but also he eliminates the in-advance knowledge of the builder's assistants, in addition to the contextualizing of the example as well as changing stones to pieces of wood and introducing three student assistants instead of a single adult one. Wittgenstein provides his example to prove how St Augustine is wrong in his idea about language acquisition. Stoppard dramatizes it with comic effects. The imitation with changes and comic treatment of the original subject makes a parody of it.

The other, yet a bit far-fetched, subject which can be considered for the aforementioned parody is the situation in which a misunderstanding occurs among a group of the same-language interlocutors. Different groups of people seemingly using the same language to communicate may find their communication sound only to figure out later that there has been a misunderstanding among them. And yet they finally succeed in a kind of communication or performing what they want to; just as Easy and the children seemingly use English words but they understand different meanings from them and yet finally they succeed in building the platform. An instance of this kind of misunderstanding can be detected in the words children use while they do not exactly mean what their parents understand from the same words. The comic misunderstanding scenes in *Dogg's Hamlet*, exemplified by the one quoted earlier, can be the parodies of various misunderstandings in communication between different groups of the speakers of the seemingly same language.

In his *Dogg's Hamlet*, Stoppard develops Wittgenstein's proposition to a comic language, as it seems to English speakers, and later uses it in *Cahoot's Macbeth*. The invented language, Dogg, embraces mainly English words ascribed different, usually opposite, meanings. Its "structure, syntax, rhythms, and intonations", Brassell confirms, "are broadly the same as English" (236). Generally speaking, the English words used in Dogg language –the name reminds the word 'doggerel'- can be roughly divided into three groups. A closer look at these groups and their meanings demonstrates Stoppard's comic intentions lying beneath such a language; however, Stoppard's contextualizing

it, in a way to create misunderstanding and thereupon confusion for the characters in both parts of the play, is the other related source of humour.

A group of Dogg words include the words and expressions whose homonyms in English are innocuous expressions of greeting, respectful terms of address, or the names of ordinary objects while their meanings in Dogg are derogatory (Hu 180). The words 'afternoon' and 'squire', for instance, are taken to mean 'get stuffed' and 'bastard/you bastard' in Dogg, respectively. Easy innocently uses these words in their English senses to greet the headmaster when he meets him for the first time[1]:

> EASY: Afternoon, squire. [This means in Dogg, *Get stuffed, You bastard.]
> (DOGG *grabs* EASY by the *lapels in a threatening manner*.)
> DOGG: Marzipan clocks! [*Watch it!] (Dogg's Hamlet 152)

The sharp contrast between the meaning intended by Easy –and by the audience who uses the terms daily- and the sense understood by Dogg, displayed by his behaviour, is itself funny. The ironical misunderstanding, which spectators are aware of, leads to confusion, whose aftermath is a comic scene for the audience. Some more instances of such terms are 'daisy' which means 'mean', 'fishes' denoting 'an insult', and 'Avocados castle cigar smoke' meaning also 'an insult' in Dogg. Not all the words, among which are the last two examples, are vividly translated by Stoppard for the readers of the play; however, the visual gestures characters display provide the audience of the play with universally accessible messages which clarify the characters' baffling verbal statements.

Conversely, the next group of Dogg words includes the terms which have derogatory or obscene meanings in English while they bear harmless senses in Dogg (Hu 180). These words also used in the context of the play usually create funny scenes for the English spectators of the play. Before the onset of the school performance of *Hamlet*, for instance, the Lady "*gets to the microphone to give her speech which is written on a neat postcard held in her gloved hand*":

[1] The words in brackets are Stoppard's own translations of the Dogg terms.

LADY: (*Nicely*.) Scabs, slobs, yobs, yids, spicks, wops …
(*As one might say, Your Grace, ladies and gentlemen, boys and girls*…)
Sad facts, brats pule puke crap-pot stink, spit; grow up dunces crooks; […]
(*Applause*. LADY *comes down the platform helped by* DOGG. […].) (Dogg's Hamlet 160)

Although Stoppard does not provide the translation of the sentences after her addressing the audience, the obscene English words and sentences, which are indeed 'sad facts', clearly do not denote any derogatory or obscene meanings in Dogg. Watching the situation while remembering the English meanings of the words the Lady utters –which is what the English spectators of the play unintentionally do; after all, they are used to the English meanings of them- the whole scene and the uttered words, which are discordantly inappropriate for such a situation, appear farcical and hilarious. Some other Dogg terms and expressions belonging to this group are 'creep', 'moronic', 'Cretin is he?', and 'pig-faced' meaning 'carpet', 'maroon', 'a request for time', and 'please', respectively.

Yet another group encompasses the terms "whose homonyms in English define objects with primary qualities that differ radically from the qualities of the objects to which the Dogg words refer" (Hu 180). These words also prove to be funny even if considered out of their context. 'Mouseholes', for instance, means 'an edible egg', 'bedsocks' means 'prince (of)', 'clock' means 'city', and 'haddock' which is a kind of edible fish in English means 'microphone' in Dogg. The context in which these words are used enhances the humour. When Dogg, the headmaster, wants to announce the name of the school performance, he asserts:

DOGG: […]
Practically…Helmet bedsocks Denmark. [*And now…Helmet Prince of Denmark.]
MRS DOGG (*Correcting him*.) Hamlet…
DOGG: Hamlet bedsocks Denmark, yeti William Shakespeare.
(Dogg's Hamlet 161)

Not only does the word ‘bedsocks’ seem amusing -because while referring to pieces of private clothing, it is used to denote a highly respected and royal person- but also the whole scene yields a hilarious effect, insinuating that Shakespeare is least understood where he is taught and most revered.

A large number of the remaining words and phrases used in Dogg language are English words which are assigned arbitrary meanings. Some of the words in this group have a kind of far-fetched relation with their assigned senses; some do not have any relation at all. ‘Sun’ is taken to mean ‘one’ -as a number in Dogg. Since there is only one sun seen by unarmed eyes in the daytime sky, it seems there is a kind of relation between the English meaning of it and its meaning in Dogg. The words ‘plank’, ‘cube’, ‘almost’, and ‘get’ do not seem to have any kind of relevance to their ascribed senses in Dogg –in Dogg, they mean ‘ready’, ‘thank you’, ‘from’, and ‘madam’ respectively. Although for the audience of the play the words seem confusing, specifically at the beginning of the play, breaking the spectators’ expectation –to hear the words with senses other than the meanings they are accustomed to assign to them- proves to be amusing. Stoppard, however, usually applies these English words in situations which ultimately create a comic effect. For instance, after Dogg knocks Easy through the wall he has just built, Easy innocently objects:

> EASY: Here, what’s your game?
> DOGG: Cube. [*Thank you.]
> EASY: Eh?
> DOGG: Cube.
> (*Then he calls out to* ABEL.)
> Cube! Abel!
> (*A cube is thrown in to* BAKER, *passed to* CHARLIE, *passed to* EASY *who puts it in place*. DOGG *to* CHARLIE *and* BAKER). Slab?
> EASY: Cube.
> DOGG: Slab.
> CHARLIE/BAKER: Cube, git!
> EASY: (*With venom*.) Git!
> (DOGG *is pleased and smiles*. EASY *is completely at a loss*. DOGG *leaves satisfied*.)

Cube!
(*Another cube follows the same rout*.)
Cube! (Dogg's Hamlet 158)

Since the words 'cube' and 'slab' have been iterated many times so far in the play, the audience has already learned their meanings in Dogg; thus, Easy's bafflement, with his gestures showing that, seems amusing to the audience. The confused Easy and Dogg-speaking characters do not understand –rather funnily misunderstand- each other and yet building the wall continues.

The elaborated and extended Wittgenstein's example of a primitive language becomes Dogg language in *Dogg's Hamlet, Cahoot's Macbeth*. Dogg language produces humour (Hunter 1982: 254) both directly, by the incongruity between the meanings of the words in English and their assigned senses in Dogg, and indirectly, by creating misunderstanding and confusion for the characters. It is thus a parody of Wittgenstein's example and theory. Moreover, since the words used in it are 'English' words the other original subject of its parody is English (Kelly 1994: 134; Jenkins 1989: 156). If it is viewed from a broader perspective, Dogg can also be judged as a parody of language, in general; however, taking language as one of the original subjects of its parody sounds a bit far-fetched and wider than the scope it presents in the play.

5.2 *Dogg's Hamlet*

Dogg's Hamlet comically dramatizes a truncated performance of Shakespeare's *Hamlet* by a group of school children for whom Shakespeare's language is a foreign language from which they understand nothing; the children's mother-tongue, however, sounds like English. There are at least three parodies in the play which are closely related to Dogg, the parodic language of the play. Still related to the parodic language of the play, *Dogg's Hamlet* primarily displays a parody of school performances of Shakespeare, in

particular, and amateur performances, in general. The primary parody of the play is detectable in both its parts –that is, when the school stage is being prepared and when Shakespeare's tragedy is performed. Since the play humorously put on stage is *Hamlet*, *Dogg's Hamlet* parodies it, as well. The parody of Shakespeare's tragedy can be traced in the plot and characters of the school performance, which are parodies of the plot and characters of *Hamlet*. Besides, there are still some other parodies in the play, which are in the framework of the parodies already mentioned.

5.2.1 Parodies Related to Dogg Language

In the realm of the parodic Dogg language in the first part of *Dogg's Hamlet, Cahoot's Macbeth*, there are at least three brief parodies which directly depend on Dogg. These short parodies take as their original subjects the song 'My Way', English-speaking sport-casters use on the radio, and the 'V sign' shown by fingers as a sign of victory.

About the time Stoppard wrote *Dogg's Hamlet, Cahoot's Macbeth*, the song 'My Way' was a very popular song. The English version of the song is an adaptation by Paul Anka of the French song 'Comme d'habitude' written by Claude François and Jacques Revaux. It became the signature song for Frank Sinatra. The lyrics of the song picture a dying man looking back on his life and deciding that he is satisfied with the way he lived it. Using the Dogg words instead of the English words of the song, *Dogg's Hamlet* first dramatizes Charlie and Baker[1] singing it and later it is broadcast from Charlie's radio while Charlie sings along with it (Dogg's Hamlet 151, 154).

[1] The names of the characters in *Dogg's Hamlet* –Abel, Baker, Charlie, Dogg, and Easy- display an arbitrary reference to English alphabet, too. "According to Signal Corps convention", Hu comments, "Abel. Baker, Charlie, Dog(g), and Easy are the names for the first squads of a military platoon, more readily understood during oral transmission than single letters" (245).

What is sung in the play, Stoppard notes, is "*to the tune of 'My Way'*:

> Engage congratulate moreover state abysmal fairground.
> Begat perambulate this aerodrome chocolate eclair found.
> Maureen again dedum-de-da- ultimately cried egg.
> Dinosaurs rely indoors if satisfied egg. (Dogg's Hamlet 151)

The English lyrics[1] of the song in addition to what Charlie sings, appearing in brackets based on its syllables, are

> And now, the end is here [En-gage con-grat-ulate]
> And so I face the final curtain [more-o-ver state a-bysmal fair-ground]
> My friend, I'll say it clear [Be-gat per-am-bu-late]
> I'll state my case, of which I'm certain [this aer-o-drome choco-'late e-clair found]
> I've lived a life that's full [Mau-reen a-gain dedum-]
> I traveled each and ev'ry highway [--de--da ul-ti-mate-ly cried egg]
> And more, much more than this, [Di-no-saurs re-ly in-doors]
> I did it my way. [If sat-is-fied egg.]

Stoppard keeps the rhythm of the original song. In addition, he preserves its rhyme scheme and its tune. The English meanings of the Dogg words, however, display how ridiculous the song seems to the English audience listening to 'My Way' in Dogg. The English name of the song becomes "satisfied egg" in Dogg. Using Dogg language, Stoppard imitates and at the same time derides the song playfully. In other words, he parodies it.

Relying on Dogg, another short parody is the dramatization of a radio sport-announcer who speaks in Dogg. Based on Stoppard's stage directions, the sport-caster announces the results of the soccer matches:

> ([…] The rhythm of the language coming out of the radio is the familiar one, appropriate to home wins, away wins, and draws. […] In addition, 'Clock' and 'Foglamp' correspond to 'City' and 'United'. Thus the result, 'Haddock Clock quite, Haddock Foglamp trog' would be delivered with the inflection appropriate to, say,

[1] Consult Appendix G for the full lyrics of the song.

> ‘Manchester City nil, Manchester United three’—an away win.[…])
> RADIO: Oblong sun, Dogtrot quite, Flange dock; Cabrank dock, Blanket Clock quite; Tube Clock dock, Handbag dock; […].
> (Dogg’s Hamlet 157)

The rhythm and structure of what is said on the radio is the same as the rhythm and structure of the sentences uttered by the radio sport-casters. The effect, however, is humorous because the Dogg words are funny for the English audience.

The ‘V sign’ is yet another brief parody in the context of Dogg language. Made by raising the index and middle fingers in a ‘V shape’, it is actually used as a victory salute, a gesture of approval, or an okay sign in English speakers’ culture as well as the cultures of many other languages. In the invented language-related culture of Dogg-speaking characters, however, it is allotted an obscene or cursing meaning. Almost at the beginning of the play Charlie and Abel start cursing each other on catching a ball:

> CHARLIE: Squire! [*Bastard!]
> (ABEL *throws the ball to the unseen person in the wings—not where* BAKER *is*.)
> Daisy squire! [*Mean bastard!]
> ABEL:Afternoons! [*Get stuffed!]
> CHARLIE: (*Very aggrieved*.) Vanilla squire! [*Rotten bastard!]
> ABEL: (*Giving a V-sign to* CHARLIE.) Afternoons!
> (Dogg’s Hamlet 148)

The visual gestures and the context make it clear for the spectators that the sign is intended to insult. It is given the obscene sense of the Western sign made by raising middle finger. For the English spectators of this scene, the meaning ascribed to the sign is shocking and, at the same time, humorous because of its contrary sense in English culture.

5.2.2 Parody of School Performances

Dogg's Hamlet starts with presenting a prep school wherein some school boys prepare the school stage for a performance of *Hamlet.* The play continues with displaying the performance. Humour prevails in the play, both when the characters prepare the stage and when they perform Shakespeare's tragedy. In both its parts, the play dramatizes the school performances humorously –i.e. it parodies the school performances. School performances are a kind of amateur performances. Viewed from a broader perspective, thus, the original subject of parody in the play can be amateur performances in general.

The characters face a good deal of humorous confusion before the performance inaugurates (Brassell 236). The Dogg-speaking school boys who are eating their sandwiches on the half-prepared stage suddenly start rehearsing *Hamlet* in its original language. As the stage direction indicates, they "*are not acting these lines at all, merely uttering them, tonelessly*" (Dogg's Hamlet 150). Easy, who is to deliver a lorry load of pieces of wood for building the stage, tries to communicate with the children in English, however, in vain. One of the children seems to understand that there is a kind of similarity between Easy's language and what they were rehearsing earlier:

> (*Another long pause*. BAKER *takes a step forward towards* EASY, *pleased with himself having a good idea*.)
> BAKER: By heaven I charge thee speak!
> (*Pause*.)
> EASY: Who are you then?
> BAKER: (*Encouragingly*.) William Shakespeare.
> EASY: (*To* ABEL.) Cretin is he?
> BAKER: (*Looking at his wrist watch*.) Trog-taxi.
> EASY: I thought so. (*Looking at* CHARLIE.) Are you all a bit peculiar, then? (Dogg's Hamlet 152)

Baker's response to Easy's first question is a happy coincidence because, like the other children, he understands neither Shakespeare's Elizabethan blank

verse nor Easy's contemporary English. Both Easy and the school children are confused; however, the spectators, who have already watched the previous scenes, know the reason for the characters' confusion and thus the ironical situation turns to a humorous one for them. Within the framework of the parody of school performances, this scene, as well as the other scenes like this one, displays a parody of captive school children's incomprehension of Shakespeare (Hunter 1984: 140).

The captive children neither understand Shakespeare nor enjoy what they do. What the children do is compulsory and it can be detected when they rehearse *Hamlet*'s lines tonelessly (Dogg's Hamlet 150) and when they show their dissatisfaction on stage (Dogg's Hamlet 161) as well as the time when accompanied by Easy they curse the headmaster while he is offstage. Dramatizing the children and Easy cursing becomes more comic when the audience finds out that the characters are cursing in different languages; they understand that they are cursing even though the obscene words in Dogg bear harmless sometimes revered senses in English and the obscene words in English possess innocuous senses in Dogg:

> EASY: Stinkbag! Poxy crank! […]
> BAKER: Pax! Quinces carparks!
> EASY: Canting poncey creep!
> CHARLIE: Daisy squire!
> EASY: Sadist! Facist!
> ABEL: Fishes! Afternoons! (Dogg's Hamlet 162)

All the curses are addressed to the absent headmaster. The children curse him because of what he forces them to do. The schoolboys' resentment displays a comic imitation of the resentment of school children of their headmasters, on the one hand, and of what they want them to do as a part of their school assignments, on the other. In a way, the original subject chosen to be parodied is the "compulsory recitation of Shakespeare by captive school children in the West" (Kelly 1994: 131).

There are still other scenes dramatizing the comic confusion of characters who are preparing the stage for the performance. Most of the confusion arises from the interaction between the English-speaking Easy and the Dogg-speaking characters. Before the onset of the ceremony, for instance, being angry with the headmaster, who is leaving the stage, Easy curses after him: "Yob!". The headmaster hears it and thinks the flowers are needed because it means 'flowers' in Dogg. The stage direction then reads:

> ([…] DOGG *reappears immediately with a bouquet which is wrapped in cellophane and tied with a red ribbon*. […] *He hands this to* CHARLIE. *March music is heard*. CHARLIE *gives the bouquet to* BAKER *who gives it to* EASY *who thrusts it into* DOGG*'s hands as he exits.* DOGG *re-enters furiously and gives flowers back to* EASY *who gives them to* ABEL *as he enters.* ABEL *gives them to* CHARLIE *who loses them while rebuilding the wall* […].) (Dogg's Hamlet 160)

Starting with a misunderstanding, the humorous spectacle represents the confusion of the participants in a school performance before they start it.

Just after this confusion, the ceremony starts and a lady, referred to as the Lady, delivers a brief speech. Dogg then distributes the school prizes which are all awarded to Fox Major, a student who plays Hamlet and does not participate in preparing the stage. To give the privileged student his first prize, Dogg announces his name. Fox Major "*climbs steps to stage and collects his prize*" and then "*shakes hands with a beaming* LADY". For a couple of more times his name is announced and he receives prizes. Then

> DOGG: […]
> Cuff-laces empty cross […] Fox Major.
> ([…] FOX *whoops when he hears his name and rushes onto the stage as before, but picks up the table, which is now quite bare, and exits triumphantly stage left. Throughout this presentation* ABEL*,* BAKER *and* CHARLIE *have been waving their flags each time* FOX *arrives on stage, but their faces reveal their dissatisfaction and boredom*.) (Dogg's Hamlet 161)

The humour of this scene reaches its pick when Fox takes the table, on which the prizes are placed, and leaves the stage triumphantly, as if even the table itself were his prize, too. The amusing scene of awarding Fox Major is in a way a parody of the discriminations practiced by some school authorities.

The headmaster then announces the title of the school performance:

> DOGG: […]
> Practically…Helmet bedsocks Denmark. [*And now…Helmet Prince of Denmark.]
> MRS DOGG: (*Correcting him*.) Hamlet…
> DOGG: Hamlet bedsocks Denmark, yeti William Shakespeare.
> (Dogg's Hamlet 161)

It is ridiculous to hear the headmaster who is the director of and a character in the school performance mispronouncing even the name of the play; the name that, as the wall built on the stage exhibits, is dedicated to him –Dogg's Hamlet. This scene, along with the performance which is a comedy rather than a tragedy, funnily insinuates that Shakespeare is least understood where he is most revered.

The performance of the "the 15-Minute Hamlet[1]" commences and it proves to be humorous. First a prologue is delivered by 'Shakespeare'. It contains seventeen best-known lines of *Hamlet* delivered intact, except for the last line "Cat will mew, and Dogg will have his day! (Dogg's Hamlet 164) in which 'Dogg' replaces *Hamlet*'s "dog" (Hamlet V.i.273). The lines are selected from various scenes and utterances of different characters of Shakespeare's tragedy. As a result of the vaguely coherent juxtaposition of the famous lines of *Hamlet* the whole prologue is syntactically sound while semantically it is ridiculously meaningless. The performance then starts while "*The* GUARDS *are played by* ABEL *and* BAKER *respectively*" and "*they are costumed for a typical Shakespeare play except that they have short trousers*" (Dogg's Hamlet 164). The visual incongruity between the Guards' short trousers and their Elizabethan costumes is itself a source of humour in the performance.

[1] In his stage direction, Stoppard calls the performance "the 15-Minute Hamlet" (Dogg's Hamlet 163).

There are still many other comic aspects in the performance of *Hamlet*, all of which point to Stoppard's humorous intentions in dramatizing a school performance. Using "cut-out sun, moon and crown" –to represent day, night, and the entrance\exit of royalties, respectively- is another amusing reference to its being a school performance. To show her own death, Ophelia, being played by Charlie, "*sits up to reach gravestone which she swings down to conceal her*" (Dogg's Hamlet 170). Instead of *Hamlet*'s play within play, acted out by actors in the original tragedy, the performance represents a puppet play (167). At the end of the performance an 'Encore' sign appears and a more over-truncated performance of *Hamlet* –in thirty-eight lines- is put on the stage; the 'Encore' is a humorous truncation of the 'the 15-Minute Hamlet' and a parody of it. All of these emphasize that the performance is a school one and at the same time they help to enhance the humour intended to dramatize the performance. Since the humorous dramatization of the performance of *Hamlet* parodies Shakespeare's tragedy too, it will be scrutinized more deeply in the next section, 'Parody of *Hamlet*'.

Although there is a variety of subjects parodied in both parts of *Dogg's Hamlet* – when the stage is being prepared for the performance and during the performance- they are all within the framework of one main subject, which is a humorous dramatization of a school performance. The primary subject of parody in *Dogg's Hamlet* can be traced in the humorous sketch of the schoolboys preparing the stage while being confused by the English-speaking Easy, Easy's funny confusion when faced with the Dogg-speaking characters, and with the play's humorous incongruities, the funny performance, which is so much abridged that the tragedy of *Hamlet* looks like a comedy in the main performance and looks like a farce in the encore. From a broader point of view, *Dogg's Hamlet* parodies amateur performances; after all, with their cuts and compromises, school performances are a kind of amateur performances (Hunter 1982: 140).

5.2.3 Parody of Shakespeare's *Hamlet*

In spite of the fact that *Dogg's Hamlet* comically dramatizes a school performance, what is performed humorously in the play is Shakespeare's *Hamlet*. A few critics, like Billington, contend that Stoppard's parody in *Dogg's Hamlet* does not include *Hamlet* (Billington 138). There are others, however, who directly or indirectly point out that the parody in Stoppard's play embraces Shakespeare's tragedy, as well (Kelly 1994: 130; Egri 87). One way or the other, the humour in the play does not exclude Shakespeare's tragedy. In *Dogg's Hamlet*, Stephen Hu comments, Stoppard "revive[s] Shakespeare's lengthy tragedy as a brief farce" (181). Parodying Shakespeare's tragedy, the school performance in *Dogg's Hamlet* exhibits a parody of the plot of *Hamlet*. It also displays Shakespeare's characters in a parodic way. The widespread use of stage props and music in the performance help to make the parody more apparent.

5.2.3.1 Plot

The school performance in *Dogg's Hamlet* modifies the plot of *Hamlet* in a way that it becomes hilarious. There are three parts in the performance: a prologue, an enactment of an over-compressed version of *Hamlet*, and an encore reprising the whole in thirty-eight lines. Unlike Shakespeare's tragedy and an ordinary performance of it, *Dogg's Hamlet* adds the prologue and the encore to its performance.

The prologue is delivered by 'Shakespeare', an added character who has no role in *Hamlet*. Being a sketchy resumé of some of the tragedy's key lines, it consists of seventeen well-known lines originally told by Fortinbras, Hamlet, Polonius, Horatio, and Gertrude. Out of their context, the lines vaguely yield a

coherent meaning although they are grammatically correct. Rendering *Hamlet*'s grand blank verse lines virtually meaningless by combining them in the way that they appear in the prologue, and having a character named 'Shakespeare' deliver them are both ridiculously comic. The humour increases near the end of it when, interrupting 'Shakespeare', "LADY *in audience shouts 'Marmalade"*" and 'Shakespeare' continuing his speech asserts "The lady doth protest too much \ Cat will mew, and Dogg will have his day" (Dogg's Hamlet 164). The English spectators\readers of the performance have already learnt that none of the participating characters in the performance, including Dogg who plays 'Shakespeare' and Lady, knows English. The word 'Marmalade' then is readily understood as a Dogg word. It actually "denotes pleasure and satisfaction" (Dogg's Hamlet 156). Although the spectators may not know the meaning of 'Marmalade' in Dogg, the tone and manner of saying it by the Lady make it clear for the audience that at least she is not using it derogatorily. Shakespeare's response to the Lady's exclamation of pleasure, then, seems a funny and insulting coincidence. In addition, having the Lady, who is a character in the play, among the audience destroys the theatrical illusion of the fourth wall while it insinuates that the present English spectators of the play are the Dogg-speaking spectators of the school performance. The prologue then creates a comic scene for the audience.

After the prologue, in a lightning-fast speed the play dramatizes ten abridged scenes from *Hamlet* and a comic mute interlude presenting Hamlet en route to England. The added interlude to the plot of *Hamlet* occurs just after the seventh scene and is Stoppard's brief onstage presentation of the sea events narrated and kept offstage in Shakespeare's tragedy; it recalls the third act of *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern Are Dead*. The interlude becomes hilarious when Hamlet is mutely presented as "*swaying as if on ship's bridge*", becoming seasick, and leaving the stage "*holding his hand to his mouth*" (Dogg's Hamlet 169).

In addition to the shipboard interlude, Stoppard introduces a few other changes to the plot of *Hamlet*, most of which prove to be humorous. One of

these modifications is *Hamlet*'s play-within-play acted out by characters in Shakespeare's tragedy while Stoppard dramatizes it by a mute puppet show (Dogg's Hamlet 169). The incongruity between Shakespeare's blank verses in the performance and the puppet show is a source of humour.

Another modification occurs in the scene where Ophelia dies. While presenting her madness, the performance adds some actions, which are not in the original tragedy, to her truncated speech:

> OPHELIA: They bore him barefaced on the bier,
> (*After her first line she gives a flower to* LAERTES.)
> Hey nonny nonny, hey nonny.
> (*After her second, she slams the bouquet in*
> CLAUDIUS*'s stomach*
> […].)
> OPHELIA: And on his grave rained many a tear…
> (*Half-way through her third line she disappears behind the screen stage left and pauses.* CLAUDIUS *and* LAERTES *peer round the side she disappeared and she runs round the other behind them*.) (Dogg's Hamlet 169)

A couple of lines later she dies sitting "*up to reach gravestone which she swings down to conceal her*" (170). In Shakespeare's tragedy, Ophelia neither slams the flowers in the King's stomach nor plays hide-and-seek with the King and her own brother or sits up to swing down a cut-out gravestone to display her death. The added actions turn Ophelia's tragic madness and death to comic spectacles which are in sharp contrast with the tragic mood of Shakespeare's drama.

Yet another slight modification of the plot of *Hamlet* can be detected at the end of the performance. Before the encore commences, Fortinbras enters while Hamlet is still alive:

> GERTRUDE: The drink, the drink! I am poisoned! (*Dies*.)
> HAMLET: Treachery! Seek it out.
> (*Enter* FORTINBRAS.)
> LAERTES: It is here Hamlet. Hamlet thou art slain.
> (Dogg's Hamlet 172)

In Shakespeare's tragedy, Fortinbras enters when all the major characters are already dead (Hamlet V.ii.344). Allowing Fortinbras to be present when Hamlet dies does not add to the humour derived from the major changes Stoppard introduces to the famous drama. There are some other minor changes like this in the performance but they are not intended to be humorous nor do they show themselves so. The rest of the compressed performance more or less follows a compressed outline of the plot of *Hamlet*.

The modifications introduced to the plot of *Hamlet* make the performance amusing; however, the truncation of Shakespeare's plot is itself another main source of humour in the performance. The swift speed of the plot thoroughly eliminates a couple of the original scenes –scenes i and ii from Act V of *Hamlet*- and it intermingles the remaining ones so that what is presented cannot display either the tragic mood of Shakespeare's tragedy or the characters' motivations for what they do and say. In the fourth scene of Stoppard's play, for instance, right after talking with Polonius about the players, Hamlet delivers nine lines of his soliloquy ending with "The play's the thing\Wherein I'll catch the conscience of the King" (Dogg's Hamlet 167). The original soliloquy which is in Act II, scene ii of Shakespeare's tragedy has fifty-nine lines (Hamlet II.ii.522-580). In Stoppard's play, Hamlet continues the soliloquy:

> HAMLET: […] (*Pause*.)
> To be, or not to be (*Puts dagger, pulled from his sleeve, to heart. Enter* CLAUDIUS *and* OPHELIA.)
> that is the question. (Dogg's Hamlet 167)

What Hamlet utters while continuing his first soliloquy originally belongs to his next soliloquy in the next Act of Shakespeare's tragedy (Hamlet III.i.1710). Besides, from all the thirty-five lines of his second soliloquy –starting with "To be, or not to be"- only the first line is delivered in the performance. Just after this in the same scene, Ophelia who has just entered says "My lord—". Hamlet without hesitation exclaims "Get thee to a nunnery!" and Ophelia leaves (Dogg's Hamlet 167). The lines Hamlet and Ophelia deliver here are indeed a

couple of lines cut out from their passionate speech in the counterfeit meeting scene in Shakespeare's tragedy (Hamlet III.i.1745-1805). In the school performance of *Hamlet*, Stephen Hu observes, "comic pace violates the convention of decorum" (183). The incongruity between the oral deliveries of lines and the pace of actions evokes laughter at the performance. In other words, the over-truncation of the plot of Shakespeare's tragedy is what renders the performance comic rather than tragic.

The encore which is the last part of the performance in *Dogg's Hamlet* dramatizes thirty-eight lines of *Hamlet* in a break-neck speed. Containing eight characters of Shakespeare's tragedy, the two-minute abstract presents a farcical version of the humorous thirteen-minute distillation of *Hamlet*. The encore is indeed a self-parody –a parody of the already performed parody of *Hamlet*. After all, nothing of the context of 3907-line *Hamlet* remains when summarized to thirty-eight lines, nor does Shakespeare's high and tragic viewpoint become clear for the audience. The compression of the plot of Shakespeare's tragedy reaches its extreme in the one-scene encore, yielding a farcical skit of it. The scenes intermingle in such a way that the spectators cannot help laughing at the performance of the tragedy. The 'closet scene', where Hamlet kills Polonius, for instance, starts with Hamlet addressing his mother:

> HAMLET: […]
> Mother, you have my father much offended.
> GERTRUDE: Help!
> POLONIUS: Help, Ho!
> HAMLET: (*Stabs* POLONIUS.) Dead for a ducat, dead!
> (POLONIUS *falls dead off-stage. Exit* GERTRUDE *and* HAMLET. *Short flourish of trumpets. Enter* CLAUDIUS *followed by* HAMLET.)
> CLAUDIUS: Hamlet, this deed must send thee hence
> (*Exit* HAMLET.)
> Do it England.
> (*Exit* CLAUDIUS. *Enter* OPHELIA*, falls to ground. Rises and pulls gravestone to cover herself* […].)
> (Dogg's Hamlet 173-4)

The characters have to comically rush on and off the stage to be able to deliver their desperately truncated dialogues. The visual speed of the characters' movements, created by the break-neck pace of the plot, is in sharp contrast with the hasty aural deliveries of the cuts from Shakespeare's stately tragic blank verses.

The encore displays how much a work of art can be abridged. It is a hilarious over-minimal presentation of the already performed minimalist dramatization of *Hamlet* and, as Stephen Hu confirms, a parody of minimalism in art (182). Although almost all the main threads of the plot of *Hamlet* sequentially emerge more or less intact in the encore, their over-compression not only omits most of the events which give them meaning and significance in the original tragedy but also intermingles and reduces the events of Shakespeare's twenty scenes into one short scene. The plot of the encore is a parody of the plot of *Hamlet* and the plot of the already performed truncated performance of it.

The three-part performance in *Dogg's Hamlet* displays a parody of the plot of *Hamlet*. It adds a prologue and an encore, both of which are comic, to the usual performance of *Hamlet*. Also, the slight modifications Stoppard introduces to the outline of the plot of *Hamlet* augment its comic effect. In addition, the truncation of the plot of Shakespeare's tragedy omits some original scenes thoroughly and merges the rest in such a way that what is performed can no more bear its original tragic mood. In spite of the fact that Shakespeare's tragedy is not the immediate subject of the parody in *Dogg's Hamlet*, its school performance exhibits a comic treatment of the plot of the very play it puts on the stage and thus parodies it.

5.2.3.2 Characters

'The 15-Minute Hamlet' performed in *Dogg's Hamlet* displays some of the characters of Shakespeare's tragedy in a parodic way. The characters in the performance represent the characters of *Hamlet* and what they deliver come from the original text; however, they are not presented like their original counterparts. The differences between Shakespeare's characters and those represented by Stoppard turn them into totally comic ones in *Dogg's Hamlet*; compared to their counterparts in the original tragedy.

The performance of *Hamlet* in Stoppard's play adds a character to the original text and eliminates some other characters from it. As mentioned earlier, the added character is 'Shakespeare' who appears once at the beginning of the performance and delivers a prologue which is a meaningless juxtaposition of seventeen lines chosen from various characters' speeches and different scenes of the original tragedy. The humorously absurd summary insinuates the meaninglessness of the performance.

The deleted minor characters are Rosencrantz, Guildenstern, Voltimand, Cornelius, Reynaldo, Priest, one of the Clowns\Gravediggers, the English Ambassadors, and the Norwegian Captain as well as the Sailors, Messengers, and Attendants. Among these characters, the Priest, who appears in Ophelia's burial scene in the original tragedy (Hamlet V.i.), is only addressed in the performance without being present onstage:

> (*Enter* LAERTES.)
> LAERTES: What ceremony else?
> Lay her in the earth,
> May violets spring. I tell thee, churlish priest…
> (*Enter* CLAUDIUS *and* GERTRUDE.)
> A ministering angel shall my sister be when thou liest howling. (Dogg's Hamlet 170)

Just before Laertes enters, the scene dramatizes Hamlet talking to the Gravedigger. Noticing Laertes, Hamlet "*withdraws to side"* and then Laertes alone enters. It is funny to see Laertes addressing the absent Priest.

There is yet another difference in presenting *Hamlet*'s characters in the performance. The Players who act out the play-within-play, 'Murder of Gonzago', in Shakespeare's tragedy are presented by puppets. The reduction of characters to puppets, which mutely perform the play-within-play, becomes still funnier when Hamlet addresses them and then the Queen comments about them:

> HAMLET: (*To puppet players*.) Speak the speech, I pray you, as
> I pronounced it to you; trippingly on the tongue.
> Hold, as t'were, the mirror up to nature
> (ALL *sit to watch puppet play. Masque music*)
> (*To* GERTRUDE.) Madam, how like you the play?
> GERTRUDE: The lady doth protest too much, methinks.
> (Dogg's Hamlet 167)

The royalties sit to watch a puppet show arranged by the Prince to "catch the conscience of the King". The comic scene portrays the puppets as parodies of their counterpart actors in Shakespeare's tragedy.

The rest of *Hamlet*'s characters are displayed in 'the 15-Minute Hamlet', however, in such a different way that almost all of them seem comic, compared to their counterparts in the original tragedy. Right after the prologue, the stage direction indicates that the Guards, Bernardo/Marcellus and Francisco/Horatio, are played by the school boys Abel and Baker, respectively. "*They are*", however, "*costumed for a typical Shakespeare play except that they have short trousers*" (Dogg's Hamlet 164). The humorous incongruity between the Guards' Elizabethan costumes and their short trousers primarily underlines the amateurism of the performance –or its being a school performance- however, it provokes laughter at the very tragedy the play presents.

The truncation of Shakespeare's tragedy in the school performance leads to some changes in the Guards' original dialogues, most of which can be detected in the first scene. Francisco usurps the line "Peace, break thee off: look

where it comes again!" (Dogg's Hamlet 164) from Marcellus' dialogue in *Hamlet* (I.i.51-52). A few lines later, Bernardo delivers Horatio's lines:

> FRANCISCO: But look, the moon in russet mantle clad
> Walks o'er the dew of yon high eastern hill. ([…])
> BERNARDO: Let us impart what we have seen tonight
> Unto young Hamlet. (Dogg's Hamlet 164)

The lines Bernardo utters here are originally the continuation of Horatio's speech, which is delivered by Francisco in Stoppard's play (Hamlet I.i.166-7, 169-70). Noticing the Ghost in the same scene of the performance, Baker who plays both Francisco and Horatio says: " 'Tis there". In *Hamlet*, however, Horatio says: " 'Tis here" when Marcellus tries to stop the Ghost by his 'partisan' (I.i.140). Besides these changes, the reduction of the first scene of Shakespeare's tragedy with 119 lines to a scene with 15 lines is but a minimal and swift presentation which cannot show the characteristics of the original Guards. All the modifications in presenting the Guards as well as the reduction of their original speeches eventually lead to picturing them humorously in 'the 15-Minute Hamlet'; they are parodies of their original counterpart characters.

Hamlet is another character portrayed differently in the performance. Almost all the words he delivers are from Shakespeare's tragedy; however, his original dialogues are so over-truncated that they not only do not display his original tragic figure but also represent a comic picture of him. The stage directions added to some of his original dialogues also modify his portrayal in the performance and enhance his comicality. In addition, some portion of his original speech is turned to onstage actions and some of the lines he delivers are originally uttered by some other characters; even the original addressees of some of his dialogues are sometimes modified.

The over-compression of Hamlet's dialogues in 'the 15-Minute Hamlet' not only represents his famous lines comically but also leads to his humorously swift delivering of them which is in contrast with the stately blank verses he employs. His most famous soliloquy, for instance, is reduced to a couple of lines and his vehement dialogue with Ophelia is minimized to a single line:

HAMLET: […]
The play's the thing
Wherein I'll catch the conscience of the King.
(*Pause*.)
To be or not to be (*Puts dagger, pulled from his sleeve, to heart*.
Enter CLAUDIUS *and* OPHELIA.)
that is the question
OPHELIA: My lord…
HAMLET: Get thee to a nunnery!
(*Exit* OPHELIA *and* HAMLET.) (Dogg's Hamlet 167)

The well-known 34-line soliloquy of Hamlet (Hamlet III.i.1710-44), which indicates his turbulent mind and his thoughts, is reduced to its initiating two lines which are further interrupted by the entrance of Ophelia and the King. All the original passionate dialogues between Hamlet and Ophelia, involving 73 lines (Hamlet III.i.1745-1817), are cut down to two dry lines which manifest nothing of Hamlet's causes for rejecting his beloved. Being very short, the lines Hamlet delivers must be uttered very fast because the other characters enter and he has no time to display the gestures and emotional gesticulations originally needed for the lines he delivers.

The added stage directions in the aforementioned scene modify Hamlet's portrayal in the performance, too. When Hamlet starts his famous soliloquy, he pulls out a dagger from his sleeve and puts it to his heart. Right then Claudius and Ophelia enter as if their presence prevented him from committing suicide. In the same scene in Shakespeare's tragedy, Hamlet neither pulls out a dagger from his sleeve nor is interrupted by the other characters just when he starts his soliloquy. The King, who is hiding to watch the arranged confrontation between Hamlet and Ophelia in Shakespeare's tragedy, enters the stage with Ophelia in the performance. In addition, Polonius, who is originally hiding with the King, is entirely omitted. What is dramatized in the school performance does not indicate that the meeting between Hamlet and Ophelia has been pre-arranged by Polonius and the King or that the King overhears the

conversations; the King is present onstage not hiding. The Hamlet portrayed in the performance is not like Shakespeare's hero.

While Shakespeare's tragedy reports what happens to its hero on the ship bound for England and does not dramatize him on-board, Stoppard's potted version displays him on the ship in a brief interlude following scene seven:

> *At sea.*
> *Sea music. A sail appears above stage left screen. Enter* HAMLET *on platform, swaying as if on ship's bridge. He wipes his eyes, and becomes seasick. End sea music. Exit* HAMLET*, holding his hand to his mouth.* (Dogg's Hamlet 169)

In a letter to Horatio, Shakespeare's Hamlet writes about what happened to him en route to England and later he talks with Horatio about the happenings on the ship (Hamlet IV.vi.2986-3003, V.ii.3503-3574). Stoppard not only modifies Hamlet's speech to an onstage one but also summarizes it in such a way that nothing of what happens to him on the ship can be seen. The actions that Stoppard's Hamlet displays –suffering from seasickness and holding his hand to his mouth- add to the humorous dramatization of Shakespeare's tragic hero.

Dogg's Hamlet sometimes presents Hamlet delivering parts of the dialogues originally uttered by some other characters. For instance, he usurps the line "Something is rotten in the state of Denmark!"(Dogg's Hamlet 166) from Marcellus (Hamlet I.iv.678); or while it is Polonius who cries out "Lights! Lights! Lights" just after the play-within-play in Shakespeare's tragedy (Hamlet III.ii.2141), it is Hamlet who shouts that in Stoppard's play (168); or in the graveyard scene, instead of the First Clown\Gravedigger, who replies to his own question – "What is he that builds stronger than either the mason, the shipwright or the carpenter?" (Hamlet V.i.3230-1, 3248-9)- Hamlet answers "A gravemaker. The houses he makes will last till Doomsday" (Dogg's Hamlet 170).

In 'the 15-Minute Hamlet', there are still some other modifications introduced to Hamlet's original speeches. Addressing the Clown\Gravedigger

just at the beginning of the churchyard scene, Hamlet starts telling his account of what happened at sea:

> HAMLET: Ere we were two days at sea, a pirate of very warlike appointment gave us chase. In the grapple I boarded them. On the instant they got clear of our ship; so I alone became their prisoner. They have dealt with me like thieves of mercy.
> (Dogg's Hamlet 170)

Right after this, the Clown\Gravedigger asks Hamlet "What is he that builds stronger than either the mason, the shipwright or the carpenter?" Besides the playful incoherence between Hamlet's account and the Gravedigger's question, what Hamlet delivers here is originally a part of what he has written in a letter to Horatio. In *Hamlet*, it is Horatio who reads the letter aloud (IV.vi.2986-3002). Assigning the Gravedigger, who does not know Hamlet and has nothing to do with him or what has happened to him, as the addressee of Hamlet's speech adds to the humour of the scene. Changing the original addressee of Hamlet's speech is not confined to this instance. A bit latter in the same scene, Hamlet addresses the clown again:

> HAMLET: Alas, poor Yorick. (*Returns skull to* GRAVEDIGGER.)
> But soft–that is Laertes. (*Withdraws to side*.)
> (Dogg's Hamlet 170)

In Shakespeare' tragedy, Horatio is the addressee of the second line and for his knowledge Hamlet points Laertes to him (Hamlet V.i.3413). The incongruity between the significance of what Hamlet says and the insignificance of his addressee creates humour in the churchyard scene and in some other parts of the performance, as well.

To the changes of Hamlet's original dialogues, Stoppard sometimes adds his stage directions. After the scene where Hamlet stabs Polonius, Claudius and Hamlet enter the stage. Claudius asks "Now, Hamlet, where's Polonius?" and Hamlet who is "*Hiding his sword clumsily*" replies "At supper" (Dogg's Hamlet 169). Not only is Hamlet's original witty reply, which he

explains in a way that has great significance in Shakespeare's tragedy (IV.iii.2685-90), reduced to a couple of words which seem irrelevantly funny without being explained but also, as if childishly frightened of Claudius, he hides his sword clumsily. Although the stage direction here points to the performance as a school one, it nevertheless sketches Hamlet as a comic rather than a tragic character.

In 'the 15-Minute Hamlet', the portrayal of the character of Hamlet is comic not only because his dialogues and actions are over-compressed but also because some parts of his original dialogues are modified as humorous onstage actions, some of the lines he is assigned to deliver belong to other characters of *Hamlet*, some parts of his speech address characters other than the ones they originally address, and the last but not the least important, some of his actions portray him hilariously; Shakespeare's tragic hero is thus parodied.

Ophelia is yet another character of Shakespeare's tragedy dramatized differently in the school performance. There are two scenes in Stoppard's play where Ophelia appears. The first time she appears, she reports her sudden meeting with Hamlet to her father:

> OPHELIA: My lord, as I was sewing in my chamber,
> Lord Hamlet with his doublet all unbraced;
> No hat upon his head, pale as his shirt,
> His knees knocking each other, and with a look so piteous
> He comes before me.
> POLONIUS: Mad for thy love?
> I have found the very cause of Hamlet's lunacy.
> (*Enter* HAMLET, *exit* OPHELIA.) (Dogg's Hamlet 166)

The compression of Shakespeare's *Hamlet* is so intense that there is no space for even a brief summary of the dialogues exchanged between Ophelia and Laertes on the one hand, and Ophelia and Polonius on the other, where they separately advise Ophelia to keep herself aloof from Hamlet and his love for her (Hamlet I.iii.467-514, 556-602). Without any introductory knowledge save what they remember from *Hamlet*, the spectators of Stoppard's play watch

Ophelia "*rushing on*" the stage and delivering the quoted lines. The lines she delivers are indeed cut from her rather long report in the original tragedy demonstrating how Hamlet, as her lover, has been to her room in a dishevelled state and how he has frightened her by gazing into her eyes deeply sighing (Hamlet II.i.973-980, 984-97). Ophelia's truncated speech neither displays her feeble personality nor her frightened and confused state as she delivers the lines. It does not reflect Hamlet's love for her, either.

Having said her few lines hastily, Ophelia leaves the stage but only to appear a short while later in the same scene to say "My lord–" and leave the stage again –it is addressed to Hamlet while he promptly replies "Get thee to a nunnery!" (Dogg's Hamlet 167). The words Ophelia delivers, "My lord–", are cut from and are reminiscent of the vehement counterfeit-meeting scene between Hamlet and Ophelia (Hamlet III.i.1745-1817). The cuts from her original speech cannot and does not portray Ophelia as she appears in Shakespeare's tragedy. Her hasty entrances and exits which are incongruous with the tragic mood of Shakespeare's tragedy together with the lines she delivers add to the comic effect of the truncation of her speech.

In the second and last scene where Ophelia appears, she is dramatized in a mad trance and then dies shortly after. Stoppard's stage directions for this scene picture her far differently from her original counterpart character: Ophelia enters delivering:

> OPHELIA: And on his grave rained many a tear…
> (*Half-way through her third line she disappears behind the screen*
> *stage left and pauses.* CLAUDIUS *and* LAERTES *peer round the side she disappeared and she runs round the other behind them*.) (Dogg's Hamlet 169)

In her mad trance, Ophelia seems to be playing hide-and-seek with her brother and the King. When she dies she sits up to swing a cut-out gravestone to conceal her. While Shakespeare's Ophelia is assigned none of these actions, Stoppard's dramatization of her portrays her comically.

Stoppard's dramatization of Ophelia in 'the 15-Minute Hamlet' is also parodic. He thoroughly eliminates Ophelia's first original dialogues with Laertes and Polonius, the dialogues which introduce her to the spectators of Shakespeare's tragedy. He cuts her original dialogues with Polonius and Hamlet to a few lines, making her enter and leave the stage swiftly in a comic manner, and also he assigns to her some childishly comic actions which are incongruous with what she asserts and the tragic mood of *Hamlet*. The consequence of all the cuts and additions is a comic and thus parodic picture of Shakespeare's Ophelia.

The school performance dramatizes the other characters of *Hamlet* differently, too. Polonius, for instance, usurps the line "Look where sadly the poor wretch comes reading" from Gertrude (Dogg's Hamlet 166). Gertrude originally asserts it about Hamlet (Hamlet II.ii.1204-5). Her remark displays her pity and affection for him, fitting a mother's feeling for her son. On the contrary, when Polonius asserts it, it indicates his contempt for Hamlet while in the original tragedy it is Hamlet who time and again manifests his contempt for Polonius. The next time Polonius appears, he finishes the scene where the puppet show is exhibited:

> (*Exeunt* ALL *except* POLONIUS.)
> POLONIUS: (*Standing at side*.) He's going to his mother's closet.
> Behind the arras I'll convey myself to hear the process.
> (*End scene*.) (Dogg's Hamlet 168)

The lines are Shakespeare's; however, they seem to be delivered as an aside to let the audience know what Polonius is going to do. In *Hamlet*, Polonius addresses these lines to the King and then he explains his reasons for hiding behind the arras in order to flatter the King and get permission from him to hide in the Queen's closet (III.iii.2302-4). In the next scene of the school performance, Polonius appears shouting "Help" and then he is stabbed by Hamlet. His brief appearance in the performance in addition to his truncated speeches does not display his original characteristics, as being a flattering,

interfering old fool who is deservedly ridiculed by Hamlet. His usurpation of Gertrude's line humorously signifies that it is Polonius who ridicules Hamlet and has pity for him.

The King and Queen who appear in the school performance are dramatized differently from their original counterparts in *Hamlet*, too. In the last scene, for instance, the stage direction indicates that Claudius and Gertrude enter to watch the fencing match while they carry their own goblets (Dogg's Hamlet 171). In the original tragedy, Shakespeare's stage direction reads "Enter KING. QUEEN, LAERTES, LORDS, OSRIC and ATTENDANTS with foils and gauntlets: a table and flagons of wine on it" (Hamlet V.ii). Having the King and Queen bear their own goblets while they enter the stage produces humorous visual incongruity. A bit later, in the fencing match between Hamlet and Laertes, Claudius is pictured as a sympathetically kind character:

> CLAUDIUS: Part them, they are incensed.
> They bleed on both sides.
> (OSRIC *and* CLAUDIUS *part them*.)
> (Dogg's Hamlet 172)

As if scared of seeing blood, Stoppard's Claudius not only delivers a line that is originally uttered by Horatio but also takes action to part Hamlet and Laertes – which cannot be seen in *Hamlet*. In Shakespeare's tragedy, it is Horatio, who out of his affection primarily for Hamlet, asserts "They bleed on both sides" (V.ii.3781). Moreover, because of the truncation of the original dialogues of the King and Queen, almost none of their original characteristics can be detected in the school performance.

Laertes who appears in 'the 15-Minute Hamlet' is different from his counterpart character in Shakespeare's tragedy. In the fencing-match scene, for instance, he displays no hesitation in deciding to hit Hamlet. In the original text, however, he is portrayed as having an internal conflict; he seems to act against his conscience in hitting Hamlet with the poison-tipped sword: "[Aside] And yet 'tis against my conscience" (Hamlet V.ii.3769). Due to the shortening of his presence and speech, the spectators cannot see or hear the reasons why he

decides to play the fencing match with Hamlet. In addition, the truncated performance of *Hamlet* does not leave enough time for the dying Laertes to utter Hamlet's name completely: "Exchange forgiveness with me, noble Ha…m… (*Dies*)" (Dogg's Hamlet 172). Commenting about Laertes' address, Stephen Hu observes: "The name of Shakespeare's protagonist becomes a pun referring ridiculously to a cured meat and to a performer who exaggerates his acting (and thereby, would belie his description as "noble")" (183). Laertes' statement is a humorous imitation\truncation of his counterpart's dialogue in Shakespeare's tragedy.

Broadly speaking, the characters in the school performance are to represent some of the characters of Shakespeare's *Hamlet*; however, they are presented differently. More or less, they deliver the same words and phrases their counterparts utter in *Hamlet* but their truncated speeches are so cut down and rearranged that the effects and significances they have in the context of Shakespeare's tragedy are all lost. The result is at least a playful –if not comic- portrayal of *Hamlet*'s characters in Stoppard's play. The first and foremost intention for such a portrayal of characters is to playfully depict a school –and thus amateur- performance; nevertheless, it embraces a parodical depiction of *Hamlet*'s characters, too.

In 'the 15-Minute Hamlet', the parody of Shakespeare's *Hamlet* is reinforced by the stage props and music –although they are primarily utilized to indicate its being a school performance and thereupon complement its parody. A cut-out sun, moon, crown, and a two-dimensional grave for Ophelia, as well as puppets to perform the play-within-play and a sail to display Hamlet's being on a ship are the props that add to the visual humour of the truncated performance. In addition to their being childishly amusing especially in a grave tragic drama such as *Hamlet*, the props are used humorously in the performance, too. In the first scene of the performance, for instance, when the Guards notice the Ghost of the King, Francisco is assigned to say: "But look, the morn in russet mantle clad \ Walks o'er the dew of yon high eastern hill". The stage direction reads "On 'but look' a cut-out sun shoots up over the stage

left screen, and descends here" (Dogg's Hamlet 164). Amusingly a day passes in a flash and it is night again. The incongruity between Shakespeare's grand iambic verses full of poetic imagery and the cut-out sun, as well as its ascending and descending so fast, enhances the visual humour of the whole scene. The props and the scenery they create in the performance, Stephen Hu accepts, complement the humour of it (183).

Musical accompaniment and sound effects are called for abundantly in the performance. They include flourish and fanfare of trumpets, masque music, lute music, sea music, flute, harpsichord, thunder, wind, noise of carouse, fireworks, hubbub noise, bell tolls, and cannon shots. Making a distinction between Ophelia's death and that of Hamlet's, the bell tolls four times when Ophelia dies and cannon shots are heard four times when Hamlet dies. The parodic encore diminishes the four cannon shots to two for Hamlet's death and reduces the bell tolls to two for Ophelia's.

The encore appearing at the end of the school performance is a repeated, yet extremely truncated, performance of *Hamlet*. It is composed of thirty-eight rearranged lines cut from the original 3907-line tragedy. Delivered by eight characters, the lines are truncations of the lines used in the previous performance, '13-Minute Hamlet'; except for Polonius's call for "help" to which "Ho" is added in the encore. None of the characters in the encore is dramatized as his\her original counterpart character. Some characters are thoroughly eliminated and the rest who appear deliver a few over-compressed dialogues which are composed of the lines they originally deliver in different scenes of *Hamlet*. They have to deliver their lines very quickly and hastily in the encore and have to run to enter and exit the stage in a comic manner. Just like the previous performance, the encore represents some characters delivering lines which are originally uttered by other characters, makes some characters perform some funny actions, and readdresses some of the characters' speeches. Some characters who could utter a couple of lines in the previous performance do not have time to speak in the encore, thus they just display some actions, most of which are not in Shakespeare's tragedy.

The encore commences with Claudius delivering a couple of lines from his original speech appearing in Act I, scene ii, of *Hamlet*. Halfway through his speech, Hamlet enters addressing the King:

> HAMLET: That it should come to this!
> (*Exit* CLAUDIUS *and* GERTRUDE. *Wind noise. Moon hinges up. Enter* HORATIO *above*.)
> HORATIO: My lord, I saw him yesternight–
> The King, your father.
> HAMLET: Angels and ministers of grace defend us!
> (*Exit. Running, through the rest of speech*.)
> Something is rotten in the state of Denmark.
> (Dogg's Hamlet 172-3)

The original Guards are eliminated and Horatio, who appears just once –i.e. here- in the encore, informs Hamlet about the Ghost. What Hamlet delivers addressing Claudius is a line from his original soliloquy (Hamlet I.ii.313-343). His next two lines are cut from the same Act of Shakespeare's tragedy but two scenes after the second scene (Hamlet I.iv.624). Not only are two scenes compressed into a couple of lines but also a scene –scene iii- is thoroughly omitted. In addition, just like the previous performance, the last line Hamlet delivers here is what Marcellus is assigned to say in *Hamlet*.

In the encore, there is no time for the play-within-play or even a mute puppet show of it; only "*puppets appear above screen*" and the characters "*sit to watch imaginary play*" (Dogg's Hamlet 173). There is still no time for even a brief dramatization of the counterfeit meeting between Hamlet and Ophelia; so it is thoroughly ignored. The original passionate dialogues between Hamlet and his mother in the original 'closet scene' are minimized to

> HAMLET: […]
> (*Enter* POLONIUS, *goes behind arras. Short flourish of trumpets*.)
> Mother, you have my father much offended.
> GERTRUDE: Help! (Dogg's Hamlet 173)

Being truncated so much, in addition to the funny recontextualizing –or decontextualizing by deleting most of the original events which establish the

ground for this scene and what happens in it, the closet scene of Shakespeare's tragedy becomes a meaningless comedy in the encore. The omission of most of *Hamlet*'s scenes and the conflation of the remaining ones, by choosing a couple of lines from each, create a break-neck pace of the dramatized events and lead to a hilarious sketch of the original characters.

The characters even have to enter and exit running to be able to catch their parts in the play. Polonius, for instance, appears only two times in the encore, first to say:

> ([…] *Enter* POLONIUS *below, running. Crown hinges up*.)
> POLONIUS: Look where sadly the poor wretch comes.
> (*Exit* POLONIUS, *running*. *Enter* HAMLET.)
> (Dogg's Hamlet 173)

Shortly after this, he goes behind the arras and shouts "Help, Ho!". Then he dies offstage. The first line he delivers here, as in the previous performance, is what originally Gertrude affectionately says about Hamlet (Hamlet II.ii.1204-5). Even, there is no time for Polonius to die onstage behind the arras as in Shakespeare's play, thus he runs offstage and dies there. The swift movements of Polonius here and the other characters in the other parts of the encore are sharply incongruous with what he and the rest of the characters utter and are in contrast with the tragic mood of the original tragedy. The over-compression of the characters' lines leads to their partial characterization, the result of which is a farce not a tragedy.

Since the encore is to be performed in about two minutes, there is no time for even a brief speech by some of the characters; they are to display a few actions instead. Ophelia, for instance, mutely appears once and then dies: "*Enter* OPHELIA*, falls to ground. Rises and pulls gravestone to cover herself. Bell tolls twice*" (Dogg's Hamlet 174). Even what she acts out to dramatize her death does not exist in Shakespeare's tragedy.

Just as in the previous performance of *Hamlet* in *Dogg's Hamlet*, the encore represents some characters delivering lines that are originally addressed to other characters. Talking to the mute Gravedigger, Hamlet explains:

> HAMLET: A pirate gave us chase. I alone became their prisoner.
> (*Takes skull from* GRAVEDIGGER.)
> Alas poor Yorick–but soft (*Returns skull to* GRAVEDIGGER.)–This is I, Hamlet the Dane!
> (Dogg's Hamlet 174)

Hamlet's first line here, as in the already performed performance, is a part of his letter to Horatio who reads it aloud in Shakespeare's tragedy (Hamlet V.i.2986-3002). Not only does Hamlet read a line of his letter but also he addresses it to the Gravedigger, as if it concerned him to know what happened to Hamlet en route to England.

The running entrances and exits of the characters in the encore and their hasty deliveries of a few cut-lines from the original tragedy are in sharp contrast with what they utter and with what the audience anticipates to hear and watch when watching an ordinary performance of *Hamlet*. The over-compression of Shakespeare's tragedy in the encore is such that none of the original characters is fully presented or developed, in addition to the omission of other characters. Furthermore, the encore, like the previous performance, represents some of *Hamlet*'s characters delivering lines originally uttered by other characters, adds some funny actions to what they originally do, and readdresses some of their dialogues. The characters in the encore are farcical pictures –parodies- of their counterparts in the previous performance as well as in Shakespeare's tragedy.

To sum up briefly, Stoppard parodies Shakespeare's *Hamlet* by parodying its plot and characters in 'the 15-Minute Hamlet', which is performed in the first part of *Dogg's Hamlet, Cahoot' Macbeth*. Although the main original subject of parody in *Dogg's Hamlet* is school\amateur performances, Shakespeare's tragedy is yet another original subject of the parody in it. The performance and the two-minute encore, which follows it,

both parody Shakespeare's tragedy; however, the encore takes as its original subject of parody the already performed school performance, as well –i.e. it is a self-parody, too. The stage props and the musical accompaniments both help to complement the parody in the performance as well as the encore.

5.3 *Cahoot's Macbeth*: A Parody of Shakespeare's *Macbeth* and Living Room Performances

The second part of the play –i.e. *Cahoot's Macbeth*- dramatizes a truncated performance of Shakespeare's *Macbeth* in a living room in Czechoslovakia during the 'normalization' period of its 1970's communist regime.

> Whereas the reduction of *Hamlet* [in the first part of the double-bill] is pure Stoppard's fun, the reduction of *Macbeth* is a brutal necessity –the only conceivable means of presenting the play in any form under the pressure of the Czechoslovakian police state.
> (Brassell 243)

The play embarks on presenting the three witches of *Macbeth* and "at first Shakespeare does not seem to be suffering much" (Hunter 1982: 141). As the performance progresses, however, first two policemen appear on the stage and later their chief, the Inspector, interrupts the performance. The intrusion of "the comic Inspector" creates confusion for the actors and the confusion is enhanced by Easy's arrival (Hunter 1982: 141; Billington 138; Egri 88; Kelly 1994).

Cahoot's Macbeth, Gabbard confirms, "mixes laughter with serious intent" (154). There are then two layers in the play. One is the serious intention to display the situation of the banned actors in Czechoslovakia during the 1970's and to criticize their suppression and how the communist regime treated them. The other is the comic portrayal of that situation in order to provoke laughter at it. "Satire", Abrams writes, "derides" however it does not use

laughter as an end but as a weapon "against a butt that exists outside the work itself" (275). It has a serious intention which is correcting the butt that it ridicules and the serious intention is achieved through derision and laughter. Stoppard's serious intention in correcting the situation of actors in Czechoslovakia during its communist regime is also achieved through poking fun at it. Although Stoppard's satiric –serious- intention prevails in the second part of *Dogg's Hamlet, Cahoot's Macbeth*, the mode he chooses to evoke laughter at his target of satire is that of parody. Stoppard's parody, however, is less striking in his humorously satiric *Cahoot's Macbeth* than in his comic *Dogg's Hamlet* (Kelly 1994: 134).

The parody of a living-room performance of *Macbeth* in *Cahoot's Macbeth* mainly depends on two other parodies: the parody of the sinister representatives of the police, in the characters of the Inspector and his team, and the parody of English language, introduced by the Dogg-speaking Easy, to which the actors resort to be able to finish their performance in spite of the threatening presence of the Inspector and his team. The parody of English language, in the form of Dogg language, is introduced by Easy and culminates in a parody of Shakespeare's *Macbeth*. In addition, Stoppard introduces a few minor changes to Shakespeare's *Macbeth* and one time he calls for a specific kind of its performance. The changes made in Shakespeare's tragedy along with its performance in Dogg result in a playful presentation of the very tragedy the performance displays.

The incongruity between the setting and what is performed is itself a source of humour in *Cahoot's Macbeth*. The play commences with "*Thunder and lightening*", presenting "*three witches in minimal light*" (Cahoot's Macbeth 179). Following this, the Shakespearean dialogues between Macbeth and the three witches are dramatized and when the hags exit, Stoppard's stage direction reads "*Lights up to reveal living room*" (Cahoot's Macbeth 180). Commenting on the incongruity between the setting and the performance of *Macbeth*, Stephen Hu asserts:

> The anachronism of Jacobean lines delivered in a contemporary setting, as reflected in the set and furnishings, and the anomaly of a theatrical performance in a domestic setting are surprising and humorous (186).

The humorous disparity inaugurating the performance of *Macbeth* constitutes the initial step for parodying such a performance.

The humorous incongruity in the play is later displayed by the entrance of two policemen. Before the Inspector interrupts the performance of *Macbeth*, his two sidekicks, hitherto unknown to the audience, intrude on the stage. Their entering the stage coincides with Duncan's arrival at Macbeth's castle:

> MACBETH: We will speak further. (*He goes to door stage right.* DUNCAN *is approaching, accompanied by* BANQUO *and* ROSS*, and by two Gatecrashers, uniformed policemen who proceed to investigate actors and audience with their flashlights before disappearing into the wings*.) (Cahoot's Macbeth 182)

The policemen with their uniforms are real state-agents whose coincidental arrival with Duncan, first and foremost, suggests their being the King's modernized bodyguards for the audience who watches the play for the first time. Their investigation of the actors and then the audience, as if they wanted to make sure there is no threat to the King's presence, develops this idea in the audience's mind. The actors carry on with their performance without any pauses or conversation with the policemen, ignoring them as if they were playing their part in the performance.

Choosing Duncan's arrival at Macbeth's castle for the policemen's onstage appearance and creating humorous visual incongruity between the Elizabethan costumes of actors and the modern uniforms of the policemen, who investigate the audience with their modern flashlights, turn the otherwise deadly serious situation to a humorous one for the audience; at the same time, the policemen's actions disillusion the audience, by piercing the imaginary theatrical fourth wall, and enhance the humour. In addition, they help to form in the mind of the audience the idea of a humorous\parodic performance of *Macbeth*; the illusionistic idea which soon will be shattered and then rebuilt

differently towards the end of the play, displaying Stoppard's self-claimed fascination with making a confident statement, refuting it, and refuting the rebuttal (Sammells 18).

Stoppard engineers more or less the same kind of humorous coincidences for the Inspector's abrupt arrival to the living-room performance of *Macbeth*. The performance of Shakespeare's tragedy seriously moves on to the time that Macbeth murders Duncan:

> MACBETH: I have done the deed. Didst thou not hear a noise?
> LADY MACBETH: I heard the owl scream and the crickets cry.
> (*A police siren is heard approaching the house. During the following dialogue the car arrives and the car doors are heard to slam*.)

And a couple of lines later where Shakespeare's tragedy introduces the sound of knocking at the door of Macbeth's castle (Macbeth II.ii.67), Stoppard's play reads:

> MACBETH: Methought I heard a voice cry, 'Sleep no more!
> Macbeth does murder sleep'–
> (*Sharp rapping*.)
> Whence is that knocking?
> (*Sharp rapping*.) […]
> Wake Duncan with thy knocking! (*Sharp rapping*.)
>
> I would thou couldst!
> (*They* [Macbeth and his wife] *leave. The knocking off-stage continues. A door, off-stage opens and closes. The door into the room opens and the* INSPECTOR *enters an empty room. He seems surprised to find himself where he is. He affects a sarcastic politeness*.)
> INSPECTOR: Oh–I'm sorry–is this the National Theatre?
> (Cahoot's Macbeth 184-5)

In Shakespeare's tragedy, Macduff and Lennox knock at the door and then appear when the drunken Porter "opens the gate" (Macbeth II.iii.17-18). In Stoppard's play, however, where the audience, who knows Shakespeare's tragedy, expects to see the drunken Porter-scene –the comic relief- and the

entrance of Macduff and Lennox, it is the Inspector who enters and proves that it has been him rapping at the door not Macduff and Lennox.

The coincidence of the murdering of Duncan and the hearing of a police siren suggests that now it will be the turn of modern police to enter and investigate the crime which Shakespeare's Macbeth has committed –still advancing the illusionistic idea of a modernized performance of *Macbeth*. The illusion is further developed by the coincidence between Macbeth's lines, referring to knocking at the door, and the sound of rapping.

Added to the policemen's investigation scene, the coincidences hitherto experienced build up the expectation in the audience to watch for the appearance of a modern-policeman, Macduff\Lennox, or based on the sequence of events in *Macbeth,* the spectators may predict the entrance of Shakespeare's funny Porter. The expectation of a policeman, Macduff\Lennox, is seemingly realized when the Inspector enters, but soon this expectation is frustrated when the Inspector and the Hostess start talking. Building up the illusion of watching a modernized performance of *Macbeth* for the audience, as well as shattering it, creates a playful performance of Shakespeare's tragedy but only to the point where the audience has not discovered the reality of the situation and the reality of the hitherto humorous character of the Inspector, whose behaviour so far is not much different from Shakespeare's comic Porter (Brassell 243).

The reality of the character of the Inspector starts to get unveiled –to the audience not the actors- when he exchanges a few words with the Hostess, who enters the stage not from the wings but from the auditorium. After his first sarcastic question about where he is and receiving a negative answer from the Hostess, the Inspector continues his comic sarcasm:

> INSPECTOR: It isn't? Wait a minute–I could have made a mistake…is it the national Academy of Dramatic Art, or, as we say down Mexico way, NADA?...No? I'm utterly nonplussed. I must have got my wires crossed somewhere. (*He is wandering around the room, looking at the walls and ceiling*.)
> Testing, testing–one, two, three…

(*To the ceiling. In other words the room is bugged for sound*.)
Is it the home of the Bohemian Light Opera?
HOSTESS: It's *my* home.
INSPECTOR: (*Surprised*) You live here?
HOSTESS: Yes. (Cahoot's Macbeth 185)

The sarcasm of the Inspector's speech becomes clearer to the audience and the Hostess when he intentionally reveals that the room is bugged, insinuating that the police are already fully aware of whatever is said and done in their absence. Reminiscent of Hemingway's old man in *A Clean Well-Lighted Place*, when he parodies a few lines of the Lord's Prayer in the Bible by replacing most of its words with the Spanish word "nada" which means nothing, the Inspector sardonically refers to the living-room performance as "NADA" –nothing. The situation becomes clear for the audience while it turns out to be dangerously serious for the actors.

Within the serious and threatening framework displayed, the Inspector, as the agent of terror and repression, turns out to be unwittingly comic. Stoppard manipulates him to create comic scenes, too. In other words, the Inspector is a parody of the sinister agent of repression or the police in a totalitarian regime (Jenkins 1989: 158). The comic dramatization of the Inspector is not confined to his engineered interruptions of the performance and his sarcasms. His ironical dialogues, displaying his jocular manner and sarcastic humour, his play with multiple meanings of the words, his ironical mistakes, his loss of patience and control leading to his speech which is a parody of Dogg language, as well as his confusion when faced with Dogg language and Dogg-speaking characters, portray him as a comic figure.

The jocular manner of the Inspector is incongruous with his threatening speech and his sinister intentions. Although most of his dialogues with the actors are intended to victimize them, the ultimate effect they have on the audience of the play is a humorous one. Speaking with the Hostess in his first intrusion on the performance, the Inspector noses a telephone-set out:

(*Nosing around he picks up a tea-cosy to reveal a telephone*.)
INSPECTOR: […] You've even got a telephone. I can see you're not at
the bottom of the social heap. What do you do?
HOSTESS: I'm an artist.
INSPECTOR: (*Cheerfully*) Well it's not the first time I've been wrong. (Cahoot's Macbeth 185)

The dramatic irony inherent in this scene reveals the gravity of the situation; a situation in which being an artist in a country means being "at the bottom of the social heap", making it shocking to possess a telephone. The jocular manner of the Inspector, however, evokes laughter, although a bitter one, towards the serious situation.

There are still other examples of the Inspector's jocular manner. Following his comment about having a telephone, the Inspector wants to know if it is practical. He picks up the receiver and "*to ceiling again*" he says: "Six seven eight one double one" and then replaces the receiver (Cahoot's Macbeth 185). A short while later, "*the telephone rings in his hand*" and "*he lifts it up*", asking:

> Six seven eight one double one? Clear as a bell. Who do you want?
> (*He looks round*.)
> Is Roger here?
> (*Into the 'phone*.)
> Roger who? Roger and out?
> (*He removes the 'phone from his ear and frowns at it*.)
> Didn't even say goodbye. Whatever happened to the tradition of old-world courtesy in this country?
> (Cahoot's Macbeth 186)

Since he picks up the receiver and calls to the ceiling –the hidden police microphones in the ceiling with the police numerical codes, the Inspector must know it well– he must expect that his police colleague is calling him. The Inspector does not put down the telephone until it "*rings in his hand*". In addition, he repeats what the caller says and it is the same police code that he has just said to the bugged ceiling. Contrary to what Stephen Hu believes –that

the Inspector really thinks that the caller is looking for 'Roger' (187)- the Inspector plays with the double meanings of the word 'Roger'. He pretends that he does not know the affirmative sense of the word, which is 'OK' or 'your message has been received'. Based on what he has already said and done, the spectators and actors perceive that he intentionally uses the term as a male name. Also, in the following scenes whenever the phone rings, the caller always is from the police department and wants to talk to the Inspector who expects it (Cahoot's Macbeth 195, 207, 208).

The comic characteristic of the Inspector is still highlighted more when a bit later the actor and actress playing Macbeth and Lady enter. Seeing the actor and at first pretending that he does not know him, the Inspector addresses him:

> INSPECTOR: […] Who are you, pig-face?
> 'MACBETH': Landovsky.
> INSPECTOR: The actor?
> 'MACBETH': The floor-cleaner in a boiler factory.
> INSPECTOR: That's him. I'm a great admirer of yours, you know. I've followed your career for years.
> 'MACBETH': I haven't worked for years.
> INSPECTOR: What are you talking about? I saw you last season–my wife was with me…
> 'MACBETH': It couldn't have been me.
> INSPECTOR: It *was* you–you looked great–sounded great–where were you last year?
> 'MACBETH': I was selling papers in–
> INSPECTOR: (*Triumphantly*)–the newspaper kiosk at the tram terminus, and you were wonderful! […] Wonderful voice! "Getcha paper!"–up from here (*He thumps his chest*.) (Cahoot's Macbeth 186)

After humiliating the actor with his sarcastic humour, the Inspector addresses the actress:

> INSPECTOR: […]–Could I have your autograph, it's not for me, it's for my daughter–
> 'LADY MACBETH': I'd rather not–the last time I signed something I didn't work for two years.
> INSPECTOR: Now look, don't blame *us* if the parts just stopped

coming. May be you got over-exposed.
(Cahoot's Macbeth 189)

The Inspector's comic sarcasms confuse even the male actor for a while. The audience, however, realizes that his funny speech is meant to victimize the actors although it does not fit his character. As a representative of the totalitarian regime, he is expected to be serious in such a situation but his jocular manner does not suit his serious intentions for the audience not the actors.

The Inspector carries on with his ironical speech and he plays with multiple meanings of some of the words he uses. "In fact", Stephen Hu comments, "he begins to pride himself on his abilities to pun and display verbal wit of a sort" (187). Knowing what is happening in the flat quite well, the Inspector decides to take a seat and watch the performance. Following the Hostess's proclamation that the performance is not open to public, the Inspector asserts "I should hope not indeed. That would be acting without authority–acting without authority!–you'd never believe I make it up as I go along" (Cahoot's Macbeth 188). Later, passing his finger over the furniture, the Inspector comments: "Look at this! Filthy! If this isn't a disorderly house I've never seen one, and I have seen one. I've had this placed watched you know" (Cahoot's Macbeth 191). The Inspector's play with words, which is "in the style of Groucho Marx that likens the premises to a bordello" (Hu 188), reveals that he "comes remarkably close to a stand-up comic" (Brassell 244). The Inspector thinks he is witty while he is comic.

There are times in the play when the Inspector's mistakes, also ironical, depict a funny sketch of him. In his first intrusion on the performance, the Inspector finally decides to sit silently and watch it. The performance of *Macbeth* resumes and reaches the point where Macbeth is named King. In a parodic way, "MACBETH *in cloak crowns himself standing above screen*" (Cahoot's Macbeth 190). The Inspector seemingly believes that the performance has just finished thus he steps forward into the light and comments: "Very good. Very good! And so nice to have a play with a happy

ending for a change" (Cahoot's Macbeth 190). His seeming ignorance leads him to step forward while he comically reveals his point of view; that Macbeth's murdering the rightful King and usurping the throne by violence and crime is a happy ending and thus is supported by him –and the Institution he is from. Carrying on his comments, the Inspector addresses an actress:

> INSPECTOR: […]
> (*To* LADY MACBETH.) Darling you were marvellous.
> 'LADY MACBETH': I'm not your darling.
> INSPECTOR: I know, and you weren't marvellous either, but when in Rome parlezvous as the natives do.
> (Cahoot's Macbeth 190)

Seemingly, the Inspector does not know that 'parlezvous' is a French word, so he uses it to show off his Italian language skill; or conversely, he does not know that Rome is in Italy not in France. The mistakes made by the Inspector enhance his comic portrayal in the play.

The Inspector's funny orders display the other aspect of his comic character. Repeatedly, he gives orders to the audience about using the lavatory –or, as Hu playfully relates, "directs the audience traffic to and from the bathroom" (194). Continuing his comments about the actress who acts out Lady Macbeth, the Inspector suddenly warns the audience: "Please don't leave the building. You may use the lavatory but leave the door open" (Cahoot's Macbeth 190). His order may seem appropriate only if the situation were violently criminal. In a peaceful social gathering, as it is the case in the play, his order not only is comically inappropriate but also, as Hu confirms, "reflects paranoia or voyeurism" (Hu 194). The command also insinuates the rigid need of totalitarian regimes for optimal and severe control over situations; however, humorously applied in the play.

Time and again, the Inspector attempts to victimize the actors by his "parody of gangster talk" (Kelly 1994: 132). When Cahoot, who plays the role of Banquo in the performance, "*howls like a dog* "and barks to defy the Inspector's terrorizing threats, the Inspector declares:

> INSPECTOR: Sit! Here, boy! What's his name?
> 'MACBETH': Cahoot.
> INSPECTOR: The social parasite and slanderer of the state?
> CAHOOT: The writer.
> INSPECTOR: That's him. […] (*Smiles*) Would you care to make a statement?
> CAHOOT: 'Thou hast it now: King, Cawdor, Glamis, all As the weird sisters promised…'
> INSPECTOR: Kindly leave my wife's family out of this.
> (Cahoot's Macbeth 193)

Understanding the implications of Shakespeare's blank verse, the Inspector intentionally plays with what Cahoot says in order to outwit and ridicule him. He, however, unintentionally reveals his jocular manner and comic character.

In his second interruption of the performance, the Inspector loses his patience and resorts to obscenities and Scottish accent to control the situation, however in vain. When he enters the room, Macduff delivers Shakespeare's line "Stands Scotland where it did?". The Inspector interrupts him: "Och aye, it's a braw bricht moonlicht nicked, and so are you, you haggis–headed dumbwits, hoots mon ye must think I was born yesterday" (Cahoot's Macbeth 204). The Inspector uses Scottish accent and words as a reply to Macduff's question about Scotland and, at the same time, he wants to show off his language ability while he uses obscene terms. When the confused Inspector is confronted with Dogg language, in his pathetically furious loss of control, he tries to bring the performance to a halt. In a parody of Dogg language, he declares frenetically:

> […] Scabs! Stinking slobs–crooks. You're nicked, Jock. Punks make me puke. Kick back, I'll break necks, smack chops, put yobs in padlocks and fix facts. Clamp down on poncy gits like a ton of bricks. (Cahoot's Macbeth 210)

Recalling the Lady in *Dogg's Hamlet*, who innocuously used most of these words in her Dogg speech without their bearing obscene senses, the Inspector applies them in their obscene English meanings. The Inspector hitherto has heard almost the entire fifth Act of the performance of *Macbeth* in Dogg, so he tries to use the same language that the actors use; however, his imitation of

Dogg language becomes a funny one because of his furiously uncontrolled manner and his application of the words in their English obscene meanings. As a helpless raging representative of the police and the political Establishment, the Inspector paradoxically evokes the audience's sympathy. "He is an almost lovable comic villain" Brassell confirms (246). "One almost worries more at the end", Hunter comments, "about what the Inspector is going to say to his chief than about the future of the hounded actors" (1982: 204).

The Inspector's confusion when confronted with Easy and his Dogg language is another comic portrayal of his character. When he intrudes on the performance for the second time, he faces Easy, who has acquired Dogg language ever since the end of *Dogg's Hamlet*.

> EASY: Useless, git…[*Afternoon, sir…]
> INSPECTOR: Who are you pig-face?
> (INSPECTOR *grabs him*. EASY *yelps and looks at his watch*.)
> EASY: Poxy queen! [*Twenty past ouch.]
> Marzipan clocks! [*Watch it!]
> INSPECTOR: What? (Cahoot's Macbeth 205)

He is totally confused and does not know what to say or do because he cannot understand Easy. The Hostess then enters to explain the situation to the baffled Inspector:

> HOSTESS: He's delivering wood and wants someone to sign for it.
> EASY: …Wood and wants someone to sign for it.
> INSPECTOR: Wood?
> HOSTESS: He's got a two-ton artichoke out there.
> INSPECTOR: What??? […]
> Just a minute. What the hell are you talking about?
> CAHOOT: Afternoon, squire!
> INSPECTOR: Afternoon. […] (Cahoot's Macbeth 205)

The dramatic irony, created by the audience's knowledge of Dogg –and some of its basic terms- and the Inspector's ignorance, dramatizes his confusion more humorously. When Cahoot curses the Inspector in Dogg with his English greeting words –which mean "Get stuffed, you bastard" in Dogg- and the

Inspector naively replies in English by saying "Afternoon", the situation becomes still funnier and renders the ignorance of the sinister agent of repression more comic.

The Inspector, who does not know what to do in order to stop the performance of *Macbeth*, finally decides to build a wall across the proscenium to separate the stage from the audience. Being helped by Boris and Moris, his colleagues who appeared at the beginning of the performance, and using the pieces of wood in Easy's lorry, the Inspector builds a wall but by the time it is completed the performance has reached its end. The Inspector's entire attempt to stop the performance, thus, fails.

Accordingly, the Inspector is pictured humorously in the play. His comicality can be traced in his coincidental arrivals, his jocular manner in his sarcastic utterances, his play with multiple meanings of the words, his ironical mistakes, his loss of patience and control, and his humorous confusion when he is faced with Dogg language. His team, Boris and Moris, is humorously portrayed, too. The comic portrayal of Boris and Moris is mainly created by synchronizing their onstage arrival with Duncan's arrival at Macbeth's castle. In other words, the Inspector and his team display a parody of the police in a totalitarian regime. At the same time, the comic Inspector and his team help to create a parody of the performances of Shakespeare under the menace of agents of repression in totalitarian countries.

Easy, the linking figure between the first and second part of *Dogg's Hamlet, Cahoot's Macbeth*, is the other character whose interruption of the performance of *Macbeth* aids in forming a parody of performances during the communist regime of Czechoslovakia. First, unwittingly he plays some roles in the performance and confuses the actors as well as the other characters in the play; then, his lorry full of pieces of wood comically takes a part in it. He also displays a parody of foreign language learners in his speech and creates the ground for the actors to perform *Macbeth* in Dogg.

After the Inspector leaves the flat, the actors resume their performance and it reaches the point where Macbeth dispatches the Murderers to assassinate

Banquo and his son. Being truncated, the performance displays two of the original three Murderers waiting to ambush their victims. Right then "Easy *appears at window and says*":

> EASY: Buxtons…Almost Leamington Spa.
> (*The* MURDERERS *are surprised to see him.* EASY *disappears from window: they peer outside to see him, but meanwhile* EASY *has entered room*.)
> Cakehops.
> 1ST MURDERER: But who did bid thee to join with us?
> EASY: Buxtons.
> (*Pause*.)
> 2ND MURDERER: (*With misgiving*.) He needs not our mistrust, since he delivers
> Our offices and what we have to do
> To the direction just.
> EASY: Eh?
> 1ST MURDERER: Then stand with us;
> The west yet glimmers with some streaks of day. […]
> Let it come down!
> (*The two* MURDERERS *attack* BANQUO.)
> (Cahoot's Macbeth 197)

In fact, Easy interrupts the performance and confuses the actors; nevertheless, the actors find it a happy coincidence and address him as the third Murderer of Shakespeare's tragedy. For the audience, who is already acquainted with Easy and Dogg language in the first part of the play, the coincidence and the characters' total misunderstanding of each other, which leads to a happy replacement of Easy with the third Murderer, yield a humorous performance of *Macbeth*.

After the murder, Easy is left alone on the stage. In his bewilderment and while he is led offstage by the Hostess, he utters "Buxtons…cake hops…almost Leamington Spa…" (Cahoot's Macbeth 198). The humour is enhanced when Easy appears again, this time to play unintentionally Banquo's Ghost:

> *([…] During the scene* EASY *is hovering at the fringes,*

hoping to catch someone's eye. His entrances and exits coincide with those for BANQUO's GHOST, *who is invisible, and he only appears in* MACBETH*'s eyeline*. MACBETH *does his best to ignore him*.)
[…]
LADY MACBETH: O proper stuff!
Why do you make such faces? When all's done
You look but on a stool.
(EASY *appears at window*.)
MACBETH: Prithee, see there!
Behold! Look! Lo!
(*He points, but* EASY *has lost his nerve, and disappears just as she turns round*.) (Cahoot's Macbeth 198-9)

Stoppard's acute timing of Easy's entrances and exits results in his unintentional appearing as Banquo's Ghost for some more times. The performance still goes on and dramatizes the scene where Macbeth, the King, consults the witches and their masters to know more about his future. The weird sisters disappear while Easy appears but this time, still unwittingly, he fills the role of the Messenger in Shakespeare's tragedy:

MACBETH: Saw you the weird sisters?
LENNOX: No my lord.
(EASY *passes window*.)
MACBETH: Who was't come by?
LENNOX: 'Tis two or three my lord, that bring you word that Macduff's fled to England. (Cahoot's Macbeth 202)

Having taken some roles in the performance unwittingly and by coincidence, Easy is confused himself. Both his confusion and his taking roles in the performance add to the humour of the play. The visual comedy is still augmented by the incongruity between the actors' Elizabethan costumes and Easy's modern clothing –especially when he unknowingly plays some of *Macbeth*'s characters in the performance.

One way or the other, the actors have hitherto been able to manage and define Easy's presence in their performance but Easy, who has lost his patience, interrupts it and with his newly-adopted tongue confuses the actors and the

other characters more than before. Following his passing the window and being taken as Shakespeare's Messenger, Easy enters timidly and declares:

> EASY: Useless…useless…Buxtons cake hops…artichoke almost
> Leamington Spa…[*Afternoon…afternoon…Buxtons blocks and that…lorry from Leamington Spa.]
> MACBETH: What?
> (*General light*. OTHERS *but not* MALCOLM *or* MACDUFF, *approach out of curiosity*. 'MACBETH' *says to* HOSTESS.)
> Who the hell is this man?
> HOSTESS: (*To* EASY.) Who are you?
> (EASY *has his clipboard which he offers*.)
> EASY: Buxton cake hops.
> HOSTESS: Don't sign anything. (Cahoot's Macbeth 202-3)

The chaotic dramatic situation with its underlying dramatic irony brings the performance to a humorous halt. Soon the performance carries on but it is stopped again by the second intrusion of the Inspector. Talking to the Inspector, who is totally confused by Dogg language, the Hostess then expresses her opinion about Easy with his strange language: "At the moment we are not sure if it's a language or a clinical condition" (Cahoot's Macbeth 205). As the Hostess's opinion illustrates, the characters are humorously confused by Dogg language.

The chaotic dramatic situation starts to get some kind of new order when Cahoot enters and starts speaking Dogg with Easy. Because of the strong terrorizing presence of the Inspector, the actors, who have just discovered that Easy is speaking Dogg and his case is not a clinical condition, 'catch'[1] Dogg language and turn en masse to it in order to perform the last Act of Shakespeare's tragedy. The parodic Dogg language completes the parodic performance of *Macbeth*.

While the actors perform *Macbeth* in Dogg, Easy who is supposed to build a platform for the actors, just like what he did in *Dogg's Hamlet*, starts

[1] After all, as Cahoot comments about Dogg, "You don't learn it, you catch it" (Cahoot's Macbeth 206).

unloading his lorry with the aid of some of the actors. Noticing the lorry, the Inspector, who is onstage and remains onstage throughout the performance of *Macbeth*'s last Act, is still more confused. Meanwhile, it is time for another happy coincidence. Easy's lorry, which is full of blocks of wood, plays Birnam Woods which comes to Dunsinane in Shakespeare's tragedy:

> MACBETH: Fetlocked his trade-offs cried terrain!
> Pram Birnam cakehops bolsters Dunsinane!
> [*I will not be afraid of death and bane
> Till Birnam Forest come to Dunsinane!]
> (*The back of the lorry opens, revealing* MALCOLM *and* OTHERS *within, unloading the blocks, etc.* INSPECTOR *sees this–speaks into walkie-talkie*.)
> INSPECTOR: Get the chief. Get the chief!
> (*One or two*–ROSS, LENNOX–*are to get off the lorry to form a human chain for the blocks and slabs etc. to pass from* MACDUFF *in the lorry to* EASY *building the steps*.)
> MALCOLM: (*To* MACDUFF *who is in the lorry with him*.) Jugged cake-hops furnished soon? [*What wood is this before us?]
> INSPECTOR: (*Into walkie-talkie*.) Wilco zebra over!
> MACDUFF: Sin cake-hops Birnam, git. [*The woods of Birnam, sir.] (Cahoot's Macbeth 208)

The visual incongruity, between the expected Birnam Forest and the displayed Easy's lorry, and the aural disparity, between what the actors deliver in Dogg and the expected Shakespeare's blank verses, in addition to the confused Inspector who interrupts the actors' lines every now and then create a hilarious spectacle for the spectators.

Besides his unwittingly taking roles in the performance, his causing confusion for the other characters, and his lorry being taken for Birnam Forest, Easy playfully displays an imitation of foreign language learners. Having caught Dogg in the first part of the play, Easy has seemingly forgotten English in the second part, *Cahoot's Macbeth*. When he is confronted with the English-speaking characters, the Dogg-speaking Easy repeats what they say precisely but seemingly without having any understanding of what he reiterates. He

repeats Hostess's already-asserted apologetic statement: "I'm so sorry about this" and then

> HOSTESS: Don't apologize.
> EASY: Don't apologize.
> 'LENNOX': Oh, you do speak the language!
> EASY: Oh, you do speak the language!
> 'MACBETH': No–we speak the language.
> EASY: We speak the language.
> 'LENNOX': Cretin is he?
> EASY: Pan-stick-trog. (Cahoot's Macbeth 204)

Easy repeats some of the English sentences he hears later, as well. Just like a fresh foreign language learner who repeats the foreign terms and sentences without having any command of their senses, Easy reiterates English terms and sentences while his situation is amusingly ironical. The spectators have already seen him in a somewhat similar situation where in the first part of the play he was faced with Dogg language and at the end he 'caught' –learnt- it. Now in the second part of the play, his treating English as a foreign language and his showing ostensibly no command of his mother tongue seem humorous. In addition, he creates funny confusion both by interrupting the performance and by his Dogg language. His case is a funny one and he thus parodies the situation of a foreigner who tries to learn a language in the very social context of that language. Amusingly, Easy shows that he has relearned English at the end of the play after repeating one of the Witches' lines –"Double double toil and trouble"- several times, by declaring "Well, it's been a funny sort of week. But I should be back by Tuesday" (Cahoot's Macbeth 211); his finishing *Cahoot's Macbeth*, is symmetrically similar to his finishing *Dogg's Hamlet*, where at the end he asserted "Cube" in Dogg language, showing that he has caught Dogg.

Since the threatening Inspector endeavours to stop the performance, the actors 'catch' Dogg from Easy and perform the last Act of Shakespeare's tragedy in it. *Macbeth*'s last Act in Dogg is itself comic, in addition to the Inspector's unwittingly-comic onstage actions and dialogues. Some parts of the

last Act in Dogg are not easily understandable for the audience but some of the most famous lines of *Macbeth* are still distinguishable even for the spectators who have not watched the first part of the play –that is, *Dogg's Hamlet*. After Lady Macbeth's death, for instance, Macbeth asserts "Dominoes, et dominoes, et dominoes" (Cahoot's Macbeth 209), which is the Dogg translation of Shakespeare's "Tomorrow, and tomorrow, and tomorrow" (Macbeth V. v. 21). The Dogg performance of *Macbeth* is humorous and it parodies Shakespeare performances under the terrorizing threats of totalitarian regimes. Besides, it subverts and parodies the very tragedy it displays (Kelly 1994: 134).

Furthermore, Stoppard introduces some other changes to *Macbeth*, as it is performed in *Cahoot's Macbeth*. After Macbeth murders Duncan, Macduff informs Ross about Macbeth who has gone to Scone to be named King (Cahoot's Macbeth 190). Right then Stoppard adds an action which is not in the original tragedy. As if enacting what Macduff has just asserted, when he and Ross leave the stage, "MACBETH *in cloak crowns himself standing above screen*" (Cahoot's Macbeth 190). What Macbeth does seems redundant here, just like what Malcolm does at the end of the performance where he "*mounts the platform*", takes "*the crown off the dead* MACBETH", and places it "*on his own head*" (Cahoot's Macbeth 210). Yet in another scene, the change Stoppard introduces to Shakespeare's tragedy seems humorous. When the actors want to perform the scene of Macbeth's feast, Lady Macbeth and the Guests enter the stage carrying their own stools and goblets (Cahoot's Macbeth 198). The humour of watching the actors carrying their own stools and goblets does not lie only in its being added to Shakespeare's tragedy; it also arises from the contrast between what they do and what their roles are in the tragedy –being the Queen and highly respected noblemen of Scotland.

Stoppard calls for yet another change in the performance of *Macbeth*; however, this time the change is not in what the actors do but in the manner they perform Shakespeare's tragedy. In his first assault on the performance, the Inspector finally decides to sit and watch it. Being aware that the actors might change the performance in his presence, the Inspector vulgarly warns them

against it; nevertheless, the actors defy his order and carry on with the performance while "*The acting is quick and casual*" (Cahoot's Macbeth 188). Recalling the compulsory performance of Shakespeare's *Hamlet* by the captive schoolboys in the first part of the play, the adult actors perform *Macbeth* compulsorily and in a way that is inappropriate for what they perform – especially since the scenes they act out in the presence of the Inspector are emotionally intense, needing professional acting skills to transfer their original senses.

Accordingly, the performance of *Macbeth* dramatized in *Cahoot's Macbeth* is a humorous sketch of performing (Shakespeare) under the menace of the communist regime of Czechoslovakia during the 1970's; thus, it is a parody of it. The humour in the performance mainly drives from its incongruous setting, intrusions by the comically sinister Inspector and his sidekicks, and its interruption by Easy as well as its last Act being performed in Dogg and a few minor changes Stoppard introduces to *Macbeth*. Although the first and foremost original subject of parody in *Cahoot's Macbeth* is the performance (of Shakespeare) in a totalitarian country, what the performance dramatizes is Shakespeare's *Macbeth* and thus the humour embraces it, as well; nevertheless, there is a nuance between these parodies. While the play humorously dramatizes the performance of *Macbeth*, almost to the verge of ridiculing such a performance, it treats Shakespeare's tragedy playfully, not mockingly (Kelly 1994: 131). The playful treatment of *Macbeth* can be detected in the minor changes Stoppard introduces to it and more vividly in translating it to the play's parodic language, Dogg.

Stoppard's serious intention underlying the humorous performance of *Macbeth* is what creates the distinction between the parodies in the second part of the play and its first part. The admixture of serious and comic intentions in *Cahoot's Macbeth* (Gabbard 154; Brassell 245) reveals Stoppard's satiric objectives which are achieved via his parodic strategy. After all, Kelly's addressing the play as "satiric parody" seems a proper commenting label (Kelly 1994: 128).

CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION

To scrutinize Stoppard's extensive usage of parody as a major strategy in his *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern Are Dead*, *The Real Inspector Hound*, and *Dogg's Hamlet, Cahoot's Macbeth,* this study has endeavoured to start with laying out a definition of parody under the light of four major twentieth century's perspectives, that is Genette's structuralist view, Barthes's poststructuralist outlook, Derrida's deconstructionalist approach, and Bakhtin's dialogic criticism. With its special tendency towards Bakhtinian approach, the proposed definition of parody in this study is that 'parody is a deliberate imitation or transformation of a socio-cultural product that takes, at least, a playful stance towards its original subject'. Based on such a definition, three divisions are suggested for parody: specific, genre, and discourse. Specific parody takes as its hypotext a specific text's or writer's manner, tone, style, diction, attitude, or idea. Genre parody presumes some or all the characteristic features of a genre as its hypotext while discourse parody assumes as its hypotext any type of human activity from verbal to non-verbal forms. This vast group includes all kinds of parodies save specific and discourse parodies. The attitude of parody towards its subject can be evaluative or non-evaluative, ironical or satirical, derisive or admiring, etc. but it must embrace at least a playful one. Based on its attitude, thus, parody can assume a variety of functions ranging from a destructive stance toward its hypotext to an appreciative one. Whatever function parody can have, it leads to a kind of recreation of its hypotext since it takes a playful stance towards it and changes\defamiliarizes it.

In his *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern Are Dead*, *The Real Inspector Hound*, and *Dogg's Hamlet, Cahoot's Macbeth* Stoppard applies parody

extensively and as his main strategy. Each of these plays exhibits a wide variety of different kinds of parodies. A rapid review of only the most important parodies in these plays, which were scrutinized in detail in the previous chapters, can display how far they depend on parody. These parodies function differently in the studied plays although there is at least one common function which can be traced in all of them: reconstruction of their hypotexts.

Generally speaking, the first and foremost original subject of parody in Stoppard's *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern Are Dead* is Shakespeare's *Hamlet*. This specific parody can be detected in Stoppard's playful treatment of characters, plot, and some themes of Shakespeare's famous tragedy. The other major parody in the play takes Beckett's *Waiting for Godot* as its hypotext. This specific parody demonstrates itself through Stoppard's playful application of Beckett's style and the characteristic features as well as some of the dialogues of Beckett's characters. There are also a variety of some other parodies in Stoppard's play which occur less often and constitute a far less portion of the play. The parodies of the probability rule, academic language, and attentive audience of a play are discourse parodies in this group. The parodic use of a line of the Bible and a line of Osborne's *The Entertainer*, on the other hand, are specific parodies, which belong to the third group of parodies in *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern Are Dead*.

The Real Inspector Hound is also a play basically feeding on parody. It has a main-frame plot and an inner one. The main-frame play starts with a parody of its audience, a discourse parody. It continues with another discourse parody which takes drama critics with their jargons as its original subject. The-play-within-the-play first and foremost parodies the whodunit genre, then -and even now- in vogue and almost in its summit when Stoppard wrote his farce. This genre parody is traceable in the stereotypical plot and characters of the inner play both when the inner play is discernable from the main-frame play and when they overlap. The other significant parody of the inner play is Agatha Christie's celebrated work, *The*

Mousetrap. The inner play thus displays both a genre parody and a specific parody simultaneously.

Stoppard's parodic strategy in *Dogg's Hamlet*, *Cahoot's Macbeth* manifests itself less vividly than his application of parody in *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern Are Dead*. This does not however mean that parody is not abundant in *Dogg's Hamlet*, *Cahoot's Macbeth*. In the first part of the play – that is, *Dogg's Hamlet*- Stoppard makes use of some different parodies whose hypotexts are primarily Wittgenstein's language game, English language, and Shakespeare's *Hamlet*. There are also some minor parodies which are, like the other parodies of the play, related to the parodic language of the play –that is, Dogg language. All of these parodies are within the main frame of the parody of school performances of Shakespeare. The parody of school performances of Shakespeare is a discourse parody which can be extended to embrace the parody of amateur performances at large. The parodies of Wittgenstein's language game and English language are discourse parodies which are developed in the first part of the play and are extended in its second part, *Cahoot's Macbeth*, as well; however, in the second part of the play the stress falls on the parody of English language. Stoppard's specific parody of *Hamlet* in the first part of the play is mainly detectable in his comic treatment of the plot and characters of *Hamlet* in the form of a school performance of Shakespeare's well-known tragedy. The other minor parodies in the first part of the play are all discourse parodies whose original subjects are the song 'My Way', English-speaking sport-casters, and the 'V sign' shown by fingers as a sign of victory.

Cahoot's Macbeth, the second part of the play, displays a discourse parody of living-room performances under the menace of totalitarian regimes. Through this parody Stoppard displays a specific parody, a parody of Shakespeare's *Macbeth*, which is mainly evident when Shakespeare's tragedy is performed in Dogg. Stoppard's parody of *Macbeth* does not include mocking Shakespeare's tragedy. It rather presents the famous tragedy in a playful manner. Within the framework of these two main

parodies, *Cahoot's Macbeth* exhibits some other parodies, too. It parodies the agents of repression in totalitarian countries, in the character of the Inspector, as well as English language. These parodies are discourse parodies. The parody of English language, in the form of Dogg language, is taken from the first part of the double-bill and it depends on Wittgenstein's theory which is parodied there; it thus parodies Wittgenstein's language game, however less emphatically.

Based on the attitude of each of the aforementioned parodies towards their original subjects, the functions that can be ascribed to them vary; however, they all have a common function in recreating their hypotexts at least playfully. They are thus intended, Stoppard declares, to "entertain a roomful of people" (Ambushes 6). *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern Are Dead*, for instance, displays an overall compassionate attitude towards Shakespeare's *Hamlet*, although "Stoppard nowhere makes a direct appraisal of *Hamlet*" (Hunter 1982: 133). The parody of *Hamlet* involves some satiric insinuations regarding its hypotext but they are rather affectionate satires. Stoppard's satiric inclination in this parody can be traced, in many instances, in his underlying the facts that "Rosencrantz and Guildenstern are so blatantly *used*, by the dramatist as well as by Claudius, […] Hamlet's gloomy introspection, and Shakespeare's shameless plot-fiddling of the pirate attack" (Hunter 1982: 137-8). The parody of Beckett's *Waiting for Godot* is appreciative in its attitude, playfully displaying Stoppard's recreation of its hypotext. The discourse parodies of the probability rule, academic language, and attentive audience of a play in *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern Are Dead* mainly depict Stoppard's mockery of them. These parodies point to Stoppard's pessimistic view about them. The playful parody of a line of the Bible and a line of Osborne's *The Entertainer*, however, do not seem to be derisive. They rather recreate their hypotexts without directly or indirectly passing judgment on them.

Stoppard's other play scrutinized in this study, *The Real Inspector Hound*, applies parodies with different attitudes and functions, too. The

parody of the audience in this play, for instance, mostly displays a playful attitude towards its original subject although it has an evaluative function, too. As Stoppard himself confirms, this parody exhibits the wishes of the audience and the dangers of their fulfilment (Ambushes 8). The parody of critics with their jargons, on the other hand, is primarily used as a destructive means to attack its original subject. Stoppard's negative opinion about critics, as thinkers rather than doers (Times 1219), manifests itself in this parody. The parody of the crime genre takes an evaluative stance towards its hypotext. Mocking the formulaic plot, the stock characters, and some other cliché conventions of the genre, Stoppard's play underlines their being unconvincing and unjustified. Almost the same kind of evaluative stance is taken towards the hypotext of the other major parody in the play. The parody of Christie's *The Mousetrap* highlights the predictable and unconvincing nature of the main elements of its original subject, including its plot, characters, and settings.

The parodies in *Dogg's Hamlet*, *Cahoot's Macbeth* portray a variety of attitudes towards their hypotexts. In the first part of the play Stoppard's parody of Wittgenstein's language game seems appreciative, depicting Stoppard's admiration of Wittgenstein's proposal. The parody of English language is not however admiring. It rather shows the parody's playful stance towards its hypotext by comically dramatizing its defect –that a word or phrase can be used by different interlocutors to mean absolutely different senses thereupon causing misunderstanding and miscommunication. The parodic school performance in the first part of the play takes a critical stance towards its original subject. It criticizes the compulsory Shakespeare courses and performances in Western schools, underlying the difficulty of understanding Shakespeare's Elizabethan language. The parodies of Shakespeare's *Hamlet*, the song 'My Way', English-speaking sport-casters, and the 'V sign', do not seem to take an evaluative stance towards their original subjects. They are primarily playful recreations of their hypotexts.

While the first part of the play basically dramatizes comic parodies, the parodies in its second part are by and large satiric. In other words, Stoppard presents an admixture of comic and serious intentions in most of his parodies in the second part. The second part of the play, *Cahoot's Macbeth*, predominantly parodies a living-room performance of Shakespeare's *Macbeth* under the menace of the communist regime of Czechoslovakia in the 1970s. Taking a serious critical stance towards its original subject, this parody criticizes the situation of the banned actors in Czechoslovakia during its communist regime and satirizes the suppression of the actors and theatres. From a broader perspective, this parody can be extended to embrace an objection to suppression of actors and theatres in all totalitarian regimes. Related to this is the parody of the Inspector as the agent of repression in communist Czechoslovakia. Because of the satirization of such an agent, this parody can be considered as an attack on all agents of repression, with their threatening and scornful behaviour towards people and actors, in totalitarian countries. Unlike these parodies, the parody of *Macbeth* frequently displays a playfully appreciative attitude towards Shakespeare's famous political tragedy, highlighting the Elizabethan tragedy's universal and modern-time application.

There are, thus, a variety of attitudes and thereupon functions that can be attributed to the parodies applied in Stoppard's aforementioned plays; nevertheless, there is at least one common ground among these various functions. Since Stoppard's parodies –and parody in general- direct at least a playful attitude toward their hypotexts, they subvert their hypotexts; however, this subversion leads to a reconstruction of the very hypotext which is subverted. The subversions of the hypotexts in Stoppard's aforementioned plays along with their recontextualizations make the original subjects bear new meanings and implications in the parody context. This can be more vividly traced in Stoppard's recurrent parody of Shakespeare's dramas. The implication of his parodies, specifically Shakespeare parodies, can finally point to Stoppard's poststructuralist notion echoed in the Player's

utterance: "Uncertainty is the normal state" (RAGAD 66). The uncertainty that Stoppard insinuates is, in a wider perspective, the uncertainty of meaning because of its shifting and unstable grounds reverberated in poststructuralist notions (Levenson 156, 162). This attitude is dramatized clearly in his other parodies, most notably in his parodies of Wittgenstein's language game and English language in *Dogg's Hamlet, Cahoot's Macbeth*. Stoppard's own words also demonstrate the playwright's mindset in this regard:

> I write plays because writing dialogue is the only respectable way of contradicting yourself. I'm the kind of person who embarks on an endless leapfrog down the great moral issues. I put a position, rebut it, refute the rebuttal, and rebut the refutation. Forever. Endlessly. […] I want to believe in absolute truth: that there's always a ceiling view of a situation.
>
> (Gussow 3)

If there is always a ceiling view of a situation, as Stoppard dramatizes in his plays, Stoppard's insistence on parodying Shakespeare can, among other things, be mostly his reverential ceiling view of the bard, provoking "the spectator to reconsider the monumentality of Shakespeare-the-icon" (Kelly 2002: 18).

The scarcity, if not the lack of, an extensive in-detail study of Stoppard's *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern Are Dead*, *The Real Inspector Hound*, and *Dogg's Hamlet, Cahoot's Macbeth* from the view point of parody was one of the reasons for undertaking the present study and it was what the previous chapters dealt with. In accordance with the analysis undertaken in this study, Stoppard relies on a variety of parodies as his predominant strategy in creating his aforementioned plays. Reconstructing a variety of hypotexts in these plays, as well as some of his later plays, Stoppard makes creative use of parody, as his predominant strategy, so abundantly that his canon can be rightly called "theatre of parody" (Sammells 16).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abrams, M. H. A Glossary of Literary Terms. 7th ed. Boston: Heinle & Heinle, 1999.

Addison, Joseph. The Spectator. Ed. Henry Morley. Vol. II. London: George Routledge and Sons, 1891.

Aristotle. Poetics. Trans. S. H. Butcher. New York: Hill and Wang, 1961.

Bakhtin, Mikhail Mikhailovich. The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays / by M. M. Bakhtin. Ed. Michael Holquist, Trans. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. Austin: University of Texas, 1990.

-------. Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetic. 2nd ed. Trans. Caryl Emerson Manchester and Minnesota: University of Minnesota, 1984.

Bareham, T., ed. Tom Stoppard: *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern are Dead, Jumpers, Travesties*, A Casebook. London: Macmillan Education., 1990.

Barthes, Roland. "From Work to Text." The Critical Tradition, Classic Texts and Contemporary Trends. Ed. Richter, David H. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1989. 1006-1010.

-------. "The Death of the Author." Modern Criticism and Theory. Ed. David Lodge. New York: Longman, 1988. 167-172.

Beckett, Samuel. Waiting for Godot. London: Faber& Faber, 1975.

Berman, Ed., ed. Ten of the Best British Short Plays. London: Interaction Imprint, 1979.

Bigsby, C.W.E. Tom Stoppard. Ed. Ian Scott-Kilvert. London: Longman, 1976.

Billington, Michael. Stoppard: The Playwright. London: Methuen London, 1987.

Bradley, A.C. Shakespearean Tragedy, Lectures on Hamlet, Othello, King Lear, Macbeth. London: Macmillan Education, 1988.

Brassell, Tim. Tom Stoppard: An Assessment. London: Macmillan, 1985.

Brustein, Robert. "Waiting for Hamlet." New Republic 4 Nov 1967: 25-26.

Cahn, Victor L. Beyond Absurdity: The Plays of Tom Stoppard. Rutherford Conn.: Farleigh Dickenson UP, 1979.

Carter, Ronald and John McRae. The Routledge History of Literature in English, Britain and Ireland. London: Routledge, 1998.

Christie, Agatha. The Mousetrap. New York: Dell, 1949.

"-------." Wikipedia, the Free Encyclopaedia. 25 July 2008 <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Agatha_christie>.

Colby, Douglas. As the Curtain Rises: On Contemporary British Drama 1966-1976. London: Associated UP, 1978.

Chaucer, Geoffrey. Canterbury Tales. Ed. A. C. Cawley. London: J. M. Dent, 1975.

Cuddon, J. A. A Dictionary of Literary Terms. Middlesex: Penguin Books, 1979.

Dane, Joseph A. Parody: Critical Concepts Versus Literary Practices, Aristophanes to Sterne. Norman and London: Oklahoma UP, 1988.

Dean, Joan Fitzpatrick. Tom Stoppard, Comedy as a Moral Matrix. Columbia: Missouri UP, 1981.

Delaney, Paul. Tom Stoppard: The Moral Vision of the Major Plays. London: Macmillan, 1990.

Delaney, Paul, ed. Tom Stoppard in Conversation. Ann Arbor: Michigan UP, 1997.

Dentith, Simon. Parody. London: Routledge, 2000.

Derrida, Jacques. "Structure, Sign, and Play in the Discourse of the Human Sciences." Modern Criticism and Theory. Ed. David Lodge. New York: Longman, 1988. 108-123.

Egri, Péter. Modern Games with Renaissance Forms: From Leonardo and Shakespeare to Warhol and Stoppard. Budapest: Akadémia Kiadó, 1996.

Esslin, Martin. The Theatre of the Absurd. 3rd ed. London: Penguin Books, 1980.

Fowler, Alastair. Kinds of Literature, an Introduction to the Theory of Genres And Modes. Oxford: Clarendon, 1982.

Gabbard, Lucina Paquet. The Stoppard Plays. New York: Whitston Publishing, 1982.

Genette, Gerard. Palimpsestes: Literature in the Second Degree. Lincoln: Nebraska UP, 1997.

Gordon, Robert. Rosencrantz and Guildenstern Are Dead, Jumpers and The Real Thing: Text and Performance. London: Macmillan Education, 1991.

Gussow, Mel. Conversations with Stoppard. London: Nick Hern, 1995.

Hamlet. Dir. Sir Laurence Olivier. Perf. Basil Sydney, Eileen Herlie, Felix Aylmer, Jean Simmons, Laurence Olivier, Norman Wooland. Janus Films, 1948.

Homan, Sidney. The Audience as Actor and Character: The Modern Theater of Beckett, Brecht, Genet, Ionesco, Pinter, Stoppard, and Williams. London: Associated UP, 1989.

Hu, Stephen. Tom Stoppard's Stagecraft. New York: Peter Lang, 1989.

Hunter, Jim. About Stoppard: The Playwright and the Work. London: Faber and Faber, 2005.

-------. Tom Stoppard's Plays. London: Faber and Faber, 1982.

Hutcheon, Linda. A Theory of Parody: The Teachings of Twentieth-Century Art Forms. New York: Methuen, 1985.

Jefferson, Ann, and David Robey, eds. Modern Literary Theory: A Comparative Introduction. 2nd ed. London: B.T. Batsford, 1991.

Jenkins, Anthony, ed. Critical Essays on Tom Stoppard. Boston: G. K. Hall & Co, 1990.

-------. The Theatre of Tom Stoppard. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1989.

Jonson, Ben. Every Man in His Humor. Ed. Martin Seymour-Smith. London: A. & C. Black, 1988.

Jump, John Davies. Burlesque. London: Methuen, 1972.

Kelly, Katherine E. Tom Stoppard and the craft of Comedy: Medium and Genre at Play. Ann Arbor: Michigan UP: 1994.

Kelly, Katherine E., ed. The Cambridge Companion to Tom Stoppard. London: Cambridge UP, 2002.

Kennedy, X.J., and Dana Gioia, eds. Literature, an Introduction to Fiction, Poetry, and Drama. 8th ed. New York: Longman, 2002.

King, Kimball, ed. Modern Dramatists, a Casebook of Major British, Irish, and American Playwrights. New York: Routledge, 2001.

Levenson, Jill L. "Stoppard's Shakespeare: textual re-visions." The Cambridge Companion to Tom Stoppard. Ed. Katherine E. Kelly. London: Cambridge UP, 2002. 154-170.

Londré, Felicia Hardison. "From Zurich to Brazil with Tom Stoppard." Modern Dramatists, A Casebook of Major British, Irish, And American Playwrights. Ed. Kimball King. New York: Routledge, 2001. 311-323.

Melling, John Kennedy. Murder Done To Death: Parody and Pastiche in Detective Fiction. London: Scarecrow, 1996.

Morgan, Margery. Drama: Plays, Theatre and Performance. Essex: Longman York, 1987.

Osborne, John. The Entertainer. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1983.

Page, Adrian, ed. The Death of the Playwright?. London: Macmillan Academic and Professional, 1992.

Page, Malcolm. File on Stoppard. London: Methuen London, 1986.

"Parody." Encyclopedia of Literary Critics and Criticism. Ed. Chris Murray. London: Fitzroy Dearborn, 1999.

-------. The Encyclopedia of Britannica. 1985 ed. 1987.

-------. The Oxford English Dictionary. 2nd ed. 1989.

Perrine, Laurence. Literature: Structure, Sound, and Sense. 2nd ed. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1974.

Phiddian, R. Swift's Parody. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1995.

Rimmon-Kenan, Shlomith. Narrative Fiction: Contemporary Poetics. London: Routledge, 1983.

Rose, Margaret. Parody: ancient, modern, and postmodern. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1995.

Rusinko, Susan. British Drama 1950 to the Present: A Critical History. Boston: Twayne, 1989.

Sammells, Neil. Tom Stoppard: The Artist as Critic. London: Macmillan, 1988.

Selden, Raman, Peter Widdowson, and Peter Brooker. A Reader's Guide to Contemporary Literary Theory. Kentucky: Kentucky UP, 1993.

Shakespeare, William. Hamlet. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1985.

-------. Macbeth. Ed. A. W. Verity. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1962.

Shklovskey, Victor. "Art as Technique." The Critical Tradition, Classic Texts and Contemporary Trends. Ed. David H. Richter. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1989. 738-747.

Stoppard, Tom. "Ambushes for the Audience: Towards a High Comedy of

Ideas." By Editors. Theatre Quarterly No.14 1974: 3-17.

-------. "Dogg's Hamlet, Cahoot's Macbeth." Tom Stoppard Plays One, The Real Inspector Hound and Other Entertainments. London: Faber and Faber, 1980. 138-211.

-------. "Playwrights and Professors." Times Literary Supplement 13 Oct. 1972: 1219.

-------. Rosencrantz and Guildenstern Are Dead. New York: Grove, 1967.

-------. "The Real Inspector Hound." Tom Stoppard Plays One, The Real Inspector Hound and Other Entertainments. London: Faber and Faber, 1980. 1-44.

-------. Tom Stoppard Plays One, The Real Inspector Hound and Other Entertainments. London: Faber and Faber, 1980.

Styan, J. L. Modern Drama in Theory and Practice: Symbolism, Surrealism and the Absurd. Vol II. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1981.

The Holy Bible, King James Version. New York: American Bible Society: 1999.

"The Mousetrap." Wikipedia, the Free Encyclopaedia. 25 July 2008 <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_Mousetrap>.

Vickery, D.J. Brodie's Notes on Tom Stoppard's Rosencrantz and Guildenstern are Dead. London: Pen, 1980.

Wandor, Michelene. Drama Today: A Critical Guide to British Drama 1970-1990. London: Longman, 1993.

Waugh, Patricia. Metafiction, the Theory and Practice of Self-Conscious

Fiction. Routledge. London 1984.

Whitaker, Thomas R. "Logics of the Absurd." Critical Essays on Tom Stoppard. Ed. Anthony Jenkins. Boston: G. K. Hall & Co, 1990. 110-120.

-------. Mirrors of Our Playing: Paradigms and Presences in Modern Drama. Ann Arbor: Michigan UP, 2002.

Wilde, Oscar. The Artist as Critic: Critical Writings of Oscar Wilde. Ed. Richard Ellmann. New York: Vintage-Random, 1969.

Wilders, John. "Tom Stoppard." British Writers, Retrospective Supplement. Ed. Jay Parini, et al. Vol II. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 2002. 343-359.

Yüksel, Ayşegül. "Aesthetic Distancing in Tom Stoppard's Drama." Drama in English Literature (18th All-Turkey English Literature Conference, 9-11 April 1997 at Bilkent University, Book of Proceedings). Ankara: Bilkent U, 1997. 131-137.

Zeifman, Hersh, and Cynthis Zimmerman, eds. Contemporary British Drama, 1970-90. London: Macmillan, 1993.

APPENDIX A

STOPPARD: A CHRONOLOGY

1937 Tomas Straussler is born in Zlin, Czechoslovakia on July 3.

1939 When Nazis invade Czechoslovakia on March 14, the Straussler family escapes to Singapore.

1942 Before the Japanese invasion of Singapore, Tomas, his mother, and brother are evacuated to India. His father is killed in the invasion.

1943 Tomas starts classes at an English-speaking school in Darjeeling, India.

1945 His mother marries Kenneth Stoppard, a British Army officer, in November.

1946 In February, the family moves to England, settling in Bristol, where Kenneth Stoppard adopts his two stepsons.

1946-1954 Tom Stoppard [TS] attends the Dolphin School, Nottinghamshire, and later, the Pocklington School, Yorkshire.

1954 TS chooses to skip university and becomes a cub reporter for the *Western Daily Press*, Bristol. He remains there for the next four years, writing theater and film criticism among other assignments.

1958 TS joins the *Bristol Evening World* as news reporter, feature writer, and theater and film critic.

1960-1961 TS quits the newspaper to write his first play, *Walk on the Water*, followed by *The Gamblers* and *The Stand-Ins*. He remains a freelance journalist for the next three years.

1962-1963 In September, TS becomes the theater critic for the *Scene*, London, using the pseudonym, William Boot.

1963 TS writes the unproduced television plays, *I Can't Give You Anything but Love, Baby* and *Funny Man*. A television adaptation of *Walk on the Water* is broadcast on British ITV in November.

1964 TS writes five episodes for the radio serial, *The Dales*, broadcasting in January. The radio plays *The Dissolution of Dominic* and *"M" is for Moon Among Other Things* are broadcast in February and April, respectively. *This Way Out With Samuel Boot*, a ninety-minute play for television, is unproduced. Three short stories appear in the anthology, *Introduction 2: Stories by New Writers*. From March through October, TS participates in a Ford Foundation colloquium in Berlin. A revised version of *Walk on the Water* is performed (in German) at the Thalia Theatre, Hamburg, in August. While in Germany, TS writes a one-act play, *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern Meet King Lear*.

1965 TS marries Jose Ingle, a nurse, in March. *A Paragraph for Mr. Blake*, a television adaptation of his short story "The Story," is broadcast in October. Another television play, *How Sir Dudley Lost the Empire*, is unproduced. In June, a two-act version of *The Gamblers* is staged at the University of Bristol.

1966 *If You're Glad, I'll Be Frank*, a radio play, is broadcast in February. The first of the seventy episodes written by TS for the radio serial *A Student's Diary* is broadcast in April. His first son, Oliver, is born on May 4. TS's adaptation of Nicholas Bethell's translation of *Tango*, a play by Slawomir Mrozek, is produced by the Royal Shakespeare Company at the Aldwych Theatre on May 25. The television play *A Separate Peace* is televised on August 22. *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern Are Dead*, revision of the earlier one-act play, is performed on the Edinburgh Festival Fringe on August 26. His first (and, so far, only) novel *Lord Malquist and Mr Moon* is published the same month.

1967 *Teeth*, a play for television, is televised in February. The National Theatre production of *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern Are Dead* opens at the Old Vic on April 11. Another play for television, *Another Moon Called Earth*, is televised in June. The radio play *Albert's Bridge* is broadcast on BBC Radio, winning the Prix Italia. The US premiere of *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern Are Dead* opens on October 16 at the Alvin Theatre, transferring to the Eugene O'Neill Theatre on January 8.

1968. It wins the Tony Award for Best Play of the Year.

1968 *Enter a Free Man*, another revision of *Walk on the Water*, is produced at the St. Martin's Theatre, London, on March 28. *The Real Inspector Hound*, revision of his earlier one-act play *The Stand-Ins*, premieres at the Criterion Theatre, London on June 17. *Neutral Ground*, a play for television, is televised by Granada on December 11.

1969 Stage adaptations of his radio plays *Albert's Bridge* and *If You're Glad I'll Be Frank* are performed as a double-bill on the Fringe of the Edinburgh Festival on August 29. TS's second son, Barnaby is born on September 20.

1970 *Where Are They Now?*, a radio play, is broadcast on January 28. *The Engagement*, an adaptation and expansion of *The Dissolution of Dominic Boot*, is televised by NBC in the US on March 8. It plays in cinemas in the UK later that year. *After Magritte* is first performed at the Green Banana Restaurant by the Ambiance Lunch-Hour Theatre Club on April 9. The first US production of *The Real Inspector Hound* opens at Brown University, Providence RI, on August 2. First US production of *Enter a Free Man* opens at the Olney Theatre, Olney MD, on August 4. TS writes a screenplay loosely based on Brecht's *The Life of Galileo*. It remains unproduced.

1971 The one-act play, *Dogg's Our Pet*, opens at the Almost Free Theatre, London, in December.

1972 The National Theatre production of *Jumpers* opens on February 2 at the Old Vic. TS divorces Jose Ingle (separated since 1970), retains custody of their two sons, and marries Miriam Moore-Robinson on February 11. Their first son (Stoppard's third), William, is born on March 7. A double-bill of *The Real Inspector Hound* (NYC premiere) and *After Magritte* (US premiere) opens at Theatre Four on April 23. The same double-bill opens at the Shaw Theatre, London, on November 6. *Tom Stoppard Doesn't Know*, a self-interview, is broadcast on the BBC program "One Pair of Eyes" in July. *Artist Descending a Staircase*, a radio play, is broadcast on November 13. TS adapts *Galileo*, his unproduced screenplay, for the stage. It remains unproduced until 2004.

1973 TS's adaptation of Federico Garcia Lorca's *The House of Bernarda Alba* opens at the Greenwich Theatre, London, on March 22. TS directs a production of Garson Kanin's *Born Yesterday*, opening on April 18 at the Greenwich Theatre starring Lynn Redgrave.

1974 US premiere of *Jumpers* opens at the Kennedy Center, Washington, on February 18. Broadway production of *Jumpers* opens at the Billy Rose Theatre on April 22. The Royal Shakespeare Company production of *Travesties* opens at the Aldwych Theatre on June 10. *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern Are Dead* is revived at the Old Vic, London, on July 8. A fourth son, Edmund, is born on September 16. NYC premiere of *Enter a Free Man* opens at St. Clement's Church on December 14.

1975 *The Boundary*, a play for television written with Clive Exton, is televised live by the BBC on July 19. Broadway production of *Travesties* opens at the Ethel Barrymore Theatre on October 30, winning the Tony Award for Best Play. The film of TS's screenplay of *The Romantic Englishwoman* is

released. TS's television adaptation of Jerome K. Jerome's *Three Men in a Boat* is televised by BBC-2 on December 31.

1976 The interrelated plays *Dirty Linen* and *New-Found-Land* are first performed at the Almost Free Theatre on April 6, transferring to the Arts Theatre, London, on June 16. This production plays at the Kennedy center in Washington later in the fall. In August, TS addresses a rally in Trafalgar Square, protesting the treatment of Soviet dissidents. *The (15 Minute) Dogg's Troup Hamlet* is first performed on the terrraces of the National Theatre on August 24. The National Theatre revival of *Jumpers* opens at the Lyttelton Theatre on September 21.

1977 The Broadway premiere of *Dirty Linen* and *New-Found-Land*, opens at the John Golden Theatre, NYC, on January 11. The New York Times publishes "Dirty Linen in Prague" on February 11 concerning repression in Czechoslovakia. TS travels to Moscow and Leningrad with a group from Amnesty International. He later visits Prague and meets with dissident playwright Vaclav Havel. The Royal Shakespeare Company production of *Every Good Boy Deserves Favour*, a stage play with music by Andre Previn, is premiered at the Royal Festival Hall, London, on July 1. A play for television, *Professional Foul*, is televised by the BBC on September 24, winning the British Television Critics' Award for best play of 1977.

1978 TS is honored as a CBE (Commander of the Order of the British Empire). The US television premiere of *Professional Foul* is presented by PBS on April 26. Rainer Werner Fassbinder's film of TS's screenplay *Despair* premieres at the Cannes Film Festival in May. A West End production of *Every Good Boy Deserves Favour* (with chamber orchestra) opens at the Mermaid Theatre on June 14. The US premiere of *Every Good Boy Deserves Favour* is performed at the Kennedy Center, Washington DC in July. *Night and Day* premieres at the Phoenix Theatre, London on November 8.

1979 *Dogg's Hamlet, Cahoot's Macbeth* is first performed at the University of Warwick, Coventry UK, on May 21, 1979; a London production opens in July. The National Theatre's production of *Undiscovered Country*, TS's adaptation of a play by Arthur Schnitzler, opens in June. In July, TS has four plays running simultaneously in London's West End. The first NYC performance of *Every Good Boy Deserves Favour* opens at the Metropolitan Opera House, NYC, on July 30. The US premiere of *Dogg's Hamlet, Cahoot's Macbeth* opens in Washington DC, in September and then opens at the 22 Steps Theatre, NYC, on October 3. The US premiere of *Night and Day* opens at the ANTA Theatre, NYC, on November 27, after tryouts at the Kennedy Center, Washington DC in October.

1980 The film of TS's screenplay of *The Human Factor* is released.

1981 The US premiere of *Undiscovered Country* is performed by the Hartford Stage Company in Hartford CT in February, transferring to the Arena Stage, Washington DC in April. *On the Razzle*, TS's adaptation of a play by Johann Nestroy, is first performed at the Edinburgh Festival on September 1. The National Theatre's production opens at the Lyttelton Theatre on September 18. TS begins an original screenplay entitled *A O P*, and works on it for the next several years. It remains unproduced.

1982 *Every Good Boy Deserves Favour* is revived with the London Symphony Orchestra. The US premiere of *On the Razzle* is performed at the Arena Stage, Washington DC in November. *The Real Thing* premieres at the Strand Theatre, London, on November 16. *The Dog It Was That Died*, a radio play, is broadcast in December.

1983 TS's English libretto of Prokofiev's opera, *The Love of Three Oranges*, is first performed at the Glyndebourne Festival, UK, on October 6.

1984 The US premiere of *The Real Thing*, with revisions, opens at the Plymouth Theatre, NYC, on January 5 (after tryouts in Boston), winning the Tony Award for Best Play. The television play *Squaring the Circle: Poland 1980-81* is televised by Channel 4 on May 31. The National Theatre production of *Rough Crossing*, TS's adaptation of Ferenc Molnar's *Play at the Castle*, opens at the Lyttelton Theatre on October 30.

1985 Revival of *Jumpers* (with revisions) opens at the Aldwych Theatre, London, on April 1. TS directs a revival of *The Real Inspector Hound* at the National Theatre. The film of TS's screenplay (with Terry Gilliam and Charles McKeon) of *Brazil* is released.

1986 The National Theatre production of *Dalliance*, TS's adaptation of Arnold Schnitzler's *Liebelei*, opens at the Lyttelton Theatre on May 27. TS's translation of Vaclav Havel's *Largo Desolato* premieres at the Theatre Royal, Bristol UK in October.

1987 The US premiere of *Dalliance* opens at the Long Wharf Theater, New Haven CT, on March 13. The Roundabout Theatre production of *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern Are Dead* opens at the Union Square Theatre, NYC, on April 29. The US premiere of *Largo Desolato* opens at the Mark Taper Forum, Los Angeles. The film of TS's screenplay of *Empire of the Sun* is released.

1988 *Hapgood* premieres at the Aldwych Theatre on March 8. TS writes a screen adaptation (unproduced) of *A Far Off Place*, from the novel by Laurens van der Post. Stage adaptation of the 1972 radio play *Artist Descending a Staircase* opens at the King's Head Theatre on August 2; transfers to the Duke of York's Theatre in December.

1989 Television adaptation of his 1982 radio play *The Dog It Was That Died* is televised on Granada TV in January. The US premiere of *Hapgood*, with revisions, opens at the Doolittle Theatre, Los Angeles, in April. The US premiere of the stage version of *Artist Descending a Staircase* opens at the Helen Hayes Theatre, NYC, on November 30. TS is appointed to the Board of the National Theatre.

1990 The US premiere of *Rough Crossing* opens at the New Theatre, Brooklyn NY in February. In September, the film of *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern Are Dead*, with screenplay and direction by TS, wins the Golden Lion Award at the Venice Film Festival. The film of TS's screenplay of *The Russia House* is released in December.

1991 *In the Native State*, a radio play, is broadcast on BBC Radio in April. The film of TS's screenplay of *Billy Bathgate* is released in October. The film of *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern Are Dead*, with screenplay and direction by TS, wins the Fantasporto Directors' Week Award.

1992 TS's marriage to Miriam Stoppard (separated since 1988) ends in divorce. He openly courts actress Felicity Kendal, who appeared in several of his previous productions. The first Broadway production of *The Real Inspector Hound* (on a double bill with *The Fifteen Minute Hamlet*) opens at the Criterion Theatre Stage Right on August 13. The first attempt at filming his screenplay (with Marc Norman) of *Shakespeare in Love* falls through.

1993 The National Theatre production of *Arcadia* opens on April 13. TS's English narration for Lehar's opera *The Merry Widow* is first performed at the Glyndebourne Festival in June. The Royal Shakespeare Company revival of *Travesties*, with revisions, opens at the Barbican on October 16. A radio adaptation of *Arcadia* is broadcast. TS writes a screen adaptation (unproduced) of *Hopeful Monsters* from the novel by Nicholas Mosley.

1994 The RSC production of *Travesties* transfers to the Savoy Theatre in London's West End on March 24. The National Theatre production of *Arcadia* also transfers to the West End at the Haymarket Theatre on May 23. A radio adaptation of his 1975 teleplay *Three Men in a Boat* is broadcast. TS writes a screen adaptation (unproduced) of Andrew Lloyd Webber's *Cats*. The Lincoln Center production (NYC premiere) of *Hapgood*, with revisions, opens at the Mitzi Newhouse Theatre on November 11.

1995 *Indian Ink*, a revision of his 1991 radio play, *In the Native State*, is first performed at the Yvonne Arnaud Theatre, Guildford UK; the London production opens at the Aldwych Theatre, London, on February 27. The US premiere of *Arcadia* opens at the Vivian Beaumont Theatre at Lincoln Center,

NYC, on March 30. The National Theatre revival of *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern Are Dead* opens at the Lyttelton Theatre in December.

1997 TS's adaptation of Chekhov's *The Seagull* is performed at the Old Vic, London, in May. The National Theatre production of *The Invention of Love* opens at the Cottesloe Theatre on October 1, moving to the Lyttelton Theatre on December 20. TS is knighted on December 12 and becomes Sir Tom Stoppard. This same year he is made an Officier de l'Ordre des Arts et des Lettres by the French government.

1998 A revival of *The Real Inspector Hound* opens at the Comedy Theatre, London, on April 22. TS ends his relationship with Felicity Kendal. The US premiere of his adaptation of *The Seagull* opens at the TheatreFour, NYC, on May 27. A made-for-HBO production of TS's screenplay, *Poodle Springs*, is televised on July 25. TS writes a screen adaptation (unproduced) of his 1993 stage play, *Arcadia*. *The Invention of Love* opens at the Haymarket Theatre, London on November 3. The film of the revision of the unproduced 1992 screenplay of *Shakespeare in Love* opens in December.

1999 The US premiere of *Indian Ink* opens at the American Conservatory Theater in the Geary Theatre, San Francisco, on February 24. On March 21, TS wins an Academy Award for his screenplay of *Shakespeare in Love*. A revival of *The Real Thing* opens at the Donmar Warehouse, London, on June 1.

2000 The American Conservatory Theater production of *The Invention of Love* (US premiere) opens at the Geary Theater, San Francisco, on January 14. The Donmar Warehouse production of *The Real Thing* plays a limited engagement at the Albery Theatre, London from January 13, before opening on Broadway at the Ethel Barrymore Theatre on April 17, winning the Tony Award for Best Revival of a Play. The film of TS's screenplay of *Vatel* is screened on May 10 at the Cannes Film Festival.

2001 The film of TS's screenplay of *Enigma* is screened at the Sundance Film Festival on January 22. The Lincoln Center production of *The Invention of Love* opens at the Lyceum Theatre, NYC, on March 29. The New York Shakespeare Festival production of *The Seagull*, directed by Mike Nichols, opens on August 12.

2002 The National Theatre production of *The Coast of Utopia* opens at the Olivier Theatre on August 3. The American Conservatory Theatre production of *Night and Day* opens at the Geary Theatre, San Francisco, on September 25. The Wilma Theatre and Philadelphia Symphony Orchestra begin a six-performance run of *Every Good Boy Deserves Favour* at the Kimmel Center, Philadelphia, on November 20.

2003 The National Theatre revival of *Jumpers* opens at the Lyttelton Theatre on June 19, transferring to the Piccadilly Theatre on November 14. *Galileo*, written in the early 1970s, is finally staged on the Edinburgh Fringe in August. NYC premiere of *Indian Ink* opens at the Walkerspace Theatre on August 16.

2004 The first Broadway revival of *Jumpers* (a transfer of the National Theatre production of 2003) opens at the Brooks Atkinson Theatre on April 25. TS's adaptation of Luigi Pirandello's *Henry IV* opens on May 4 at the Donmar Warehouse, London.

2005 TS creates a half-hour stage version of William Shakespeare's *The Merchant of Venice* for young actors. *Heroes*, TS's adaptation of Gérald Sibleyras' *Le Vent de Peupliers* opens at Wyndham's Theatre, London, on October 18.

2006 The American premiere of *Henry IV* is presented by the Repertory Theatre of St. Louis on February 8. *Rock 'n' Roll* premieres at the Royal Court Theatre, London on June 3, then transfers to the West End, opening on July 22 at the Duke of York's Theatre. The US premiere of *The Coast of Utopia* trilogy of plays ("significantly revised") begins previews at New York's Lincoln Center on October 17.

2007 The American premiere of *Heroes* opens at the Geffen Theatre, Los Angeles on April 10. *The Bourne Ultimatum*, the film of TS's screenplay (co-written with Tony Gilroy) is released.

APPENDIX B

NOTABLE PRODUCTIONS OF *ROSENCRANTZ AND GUILDENSTERN ARE DEAD*

The first three prductions and full list of the casts are at the beginning of *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern Are Dead*.

UK

The play had its first incarnation as a 1964 one-act, *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern Meet King Lear*. The expanded version under the current title was first staged at the Edinburgh Festival Fringe on August 24, 1966 by the Oxford Theatre Group. The play debuted in London with a National Theatre production directed by Derek Goldby at the Old Vic. It premiered on April 11, 1967 with John Stride as Rosencrantz, Edward Petherbridge as Guildenstern, and John McEnery as Hamlet.

BROADWAY

Rosencrantz & Guildenstern had a two year-long Broadway run October 9, 1967 – October 19, 1968 initially at the Alvin Theatre, transferring to the Eugene O'Neill Theatre on January 8, 1968. It was directed by Derek Goldby and designed by Desmond Heeley with Paul Hecht as the Player, Brian Murray as Rosencrantz and John Wood as Guildenstern. The play was nominated for eight Tony Awards, and won four (including Best Play); three of the actors were nominated for Tonys, but none of them won. It had a 1987 New York revival by Roundabout Theatre at the Union Square Theatre.

CINEMA

The play was produced as the film *Rosencrantz & Guildenstern Are Dead* in 1990, with screenplay and direction by Stoppard. It starred Gary Oldman and Tim Roth in the title roles, respectively, Richard Dreyfuss as the Player, Joanna Roth as Ophelia, Ian Richardson as Polonius, Joanna Miles as Gertrude, Donald Sumpter as Claudius and Iain Glen as Hamlet.

The film stars Gary Oldman as Rosencrantz, Tim Roth as Guildenstern and Richard Dreyfuss as the leading player. It also features Iain Glen as Prince Hamlet and Donald Sumpter as King Claudius. The film was shot in various locations around the former Yugoslavia.

APPENDIX C

MAJOR PRODUCTIONS OF *THE REAL INSPECTOR HOUND*

1968 Its first performance took place at the Criterion Theatre in London on June 17, with the cast as follows:

Moon - Richard Briers
Birdboot - Ronnie Barker
Mrs. Drudge - Josephine Tewson
Simon Gascoyne - Robin Ellis
Felicity Cunningham - Patricia Shakesby
Cynthia Muldoon - Caroline Blakiston
Major Magnus Muldoon - Antony Webb
Inspector Hound - Hugh Walters

The play was directed by Robert Chetwyn and the design was completed by Hutchinson Stott.

1972 The first New York production of the play, which was with *After Magritte*, was staged at Theatre Four on April 23. Its director was Joseph Hardy.

1972 The play was revived with *After Magritte* by Dolphin Co. at Shaw Theatre on November 6. Its director was Nigel Gordon. On November 23, it was staged with *If You're Glad I'll be Frank* at Young Vic Theatre.

1985 Stoppard himself directed a revival performance of the play in the National Theatre.

1985 The first Broadway production of the play, on a double bill with *The Fifteen Minute Hamlet*, opened at the Criterion Theatre Stage Right on August 13.

1998 A revival of the play opened at the Comedy Theatre, London, on April 22.

APPENDIX D

THE MOUSETRAP AND ITS PRODUCTIONS[1]

As a stage play, *The Mousetrap* had its world premiere at the Theatre Royal, Nottingham on 6 October 1952. Its pre-West End tour then took it to the New Theatre, Oxford, the Manchester Opera House, the Royal Court Theatre, Liverpool, the Theatre Royal, Newcastle, the Grand Theatre Leeds, and the Alexandra Theatre in Birmingham before it began its run in London on 25 November 1952 at the New Ambassadors Theatre. It ran at this theatre until Saturday, 23 March 1974 when it was immediately transferred to the St Martin's Theatre where it reopened on March 25 –thus keeping its 'initial run' status. As of 10 April 2008 it has clocked up a record-breaking 23,074 performances, with the play still running at the St Martin's Theatre. The director of the play for many years has been David Turner.

The original West End cast included Richard Attenborough as Sergeant Trotter and his wife Sheila Sim as Mollie Ralston. Since the retirement of Mysie Monte and David Raven, who both made history by remaining in the cast for more than 11 years each in their roles as Mrs Boyle and Major Metcalf, the cast has been changed annually. The change usually occurs around late November around the anniversary of the play's opening, and was the initiative of Sir Peter Saunders, the original producer.

The play has also made theatrical history by having an original 'cast member' survive all the cast changes since its opening night. The late Deryck Guyler can still be heard, via a recording, reading the radio news bulletin in the play to this present day. The set has been changed in 1965 and 1999, but one prop survives from the original opening –the clock which sits on the mantelpiece of the fire in the main hall.

[1] Most of the information provided here can be found in Wikipedia, the Free Encyclopaedia.

Notable milestones in the play's history include:

1955, 22 April – 1,000th performance

1957, 13 September – Longest-ever run of a 'straight' play in the West End.

1958, 12 April 1958 – Longest-ever run of a show in the West End with 2239 performances.

1964, 9 December – 5,000th performance

1976, 17 December – 10,000th performance

2000, 16 December – 20,000th performance

A staging at the Toronto Truck Theatre in Toronto, Ontario, that opened on 19 August 1977 became Canada's longest running show. It was finally closed on 18 January 2004 after a run of twenty-six years and over 9,000 performances.

APPENDIX E

FIRST PRODUCTIONS OF *DOGG'S HAMLET, CAHOOT'S MACBETH*

All the following productions were by the British American Repertory Company and directed by Ed Berman.

First production: Arts Centre, University of Warwick, 21 May 1979.
First London production: Collegiate Theatre, Bloomsbury, 17 July 1979.
First American production: Terrace Theatre, Kennedy Centre, Washington. September 1979.
First New York production: 22 Steps Theatre, 30 October 1979.

APPENDIX F

A GLOSSARY OF DOGG WORDS IN *DOGG'S HAMLET, CAHOOT'S MACBETH*

The following list of words includes the Dogg terms in the play which are translated by Stoppard himself[1].

Afternoons!: Get stuffed!
Afternoon, squire.: Get stuffed, you bastard.
albatross: plans
almost: from
artichoke: lorry
Avocados castle cigar smoke.: An insult.
Avocados castle sofa Dogg!: An insult.
bedsocks: Price of
bicycles: An obscenity
Blanket Clock: Name of a soccer team
block: next
breakfast: testing
brick: here
bright: eight

Cabrank: Name of a soccer team
cake hops: timber or wood
cauliflower: left (in direction)
Check mumble hardly out.: Here are the football results.
clock: city
creep: carpet
Cretin is he?: What time is it?
Cretinous.: What time is it?
Cretinous, pig-faced?: Have you got the time, please?
cube: thanks
Cutlery.: Excuse me.
daisy: mean
Daisy vanilla!: An insult.

[1] There is a (typing) mistake in translating the numbers in the edition of *Dogg's Hamlet, Cahoot's Macbeth* used in this study. At the beginning of the play, when Abel says "pan–slack", Stoppard's provided translation for these words reads "four–five" (147). In the other parts of the play, however, "pan" is translated as "five" and "slack " is translated as "four".

dock: two
dogtrot: Name of a soccer team
dunce: twelve
even: I've got
Even ran?: What have you got?
Fag ends likely butter consequential.: An agreement about the heat.
Fishes!: An insult.
Flange: Name of a soccer team
foglamp: united
Frankly: for
Geraniums!?: How are you!?
get: madam
git: sir
gracious laxative: dead butcher
gymshoes: excellent
haddock: microphone
Haddock priest.: Microphone is dead.
Haddock Clock: Name of a soccer team
Haddock Foglamp: Name of a soccer team
Handbag: Name of a soccer team
hardly: right (in direction)
hollyhocks: ham (cured meat)
marmalade: an expression of pleasure and approval
Marzipan clocks!: Watch it!
moronic: maroon
moronic creep: maroon carpet
mouseholes: egg
nil: quite (a quantitative term)
nit: no
none: nine
oblong: division
oblong sun: division one
onyx hardly: right hand down
pan: five
pax: lout
Pax! Quinces carparks!: Insults.
pelican crash: cream cheese
Phew---cycle racks hardly butter fag ends.: Phew---(a comment about the heat.)
Picknicking: Name of a soccer team
pig-faced: please
Plank?: Ready?
Pontoon crumble.: A command about the lorry.
poxy: half past the hour
poxy queen: twenty past ouch
practically: and now
priest: is dead

Quinces carparks!: An insult.
Quinces ice-packs!: An insult.
scabs: your grace
six pints carparks: An insult or obscenity.
slab: okay, yes
slack: four
slack-dunce: 4:10 o'clock
slight: seven
slobs: ladies
sofa: An insult or obscenity.
spicks: boys
squire: bastard
sun: one
taxi: a number about time
tissue: straight (in direction)
trog: three
Tube Clock: Name of a soccer team
tun: ten
Undertake sun pelican frankly sun mousehole?: Swap you one cream cheese for one egg?
Undertake sun hollyhocks frankly pelican crash?: Swap you one ham for one cream cheese?
Upside artichoke almost Leamington Spa?: Have you seen the lorry from Leamington Spa?
Upside cakehops?: Have you brought the blocks?
Useless.: Afternoon, good day.
vanilla: rotten
very true: need salt
what: eleven
Wonder: Name of a soccer team
wops: girls
yeti: by
yob: flowers
yobs: gentlemen

APPENDIX G

'MY WAY' LYRICS

The song was recorded in Hollywood on December 30, 1968.

And now, the end is here
And so I face the final curtain
My friend, I'll say it clear
I'll state my case, of which I'm certain
I've lived a life that's full
I travelled each and ev'ry highway
And more, much more than this, I did it my way

Regrets, I've had a few
But then again, too few to mention
I did what I had to do and saw it through without exemption
I planned each charted course, each careful step along the byway
And more, much more than this, I did it my way

Yes, there were times, I'm sure you knew
When I bit off more than I could chew
But through it all, when there was doubt
I ate it up and spit it out
I faced it all and I stood tall and did it my way

I've loved, I've laughed and cried
I've had my fill, my share of losing
And now, as tears subside, I find it all so amusing
To think I did all that
And may I say, not in a shy way,
"Oh, no, oh, no, not me, I did it my way"

For what is a man, what has he got?
If not himself, then he has naught
To say the things he truly feels and not the words of one who kneels
The record shows I took the blows and did it my way!

Yes, it was my way.

APPENDIX H

CURRICULUM VITAE

Mohammad Reza Sadrian

Islamic Azad University,
Faculty of Humanities,
Dept. of English Translation
Islamshahr, Iran.
Email. mrsadrian@yahoo.com

EDUCATION:

2004 to present	Ph.D., English Literature, Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Turkey.
1997-1999	M.A. English Language and Literature, Islamic Azad University, (Tehran Central Branch), Tehran, Iran.
1993-1997	B.A. English Language and Literature, Islamic Azad University, (Boroujerd Branch), Boroujerd, Iran.
1991-1993	Associate Degree Teaching English, Motahari Teacher Training Centre, Boroujerd, Iran.

JOB EXPERIENCE:

2000- Present	Instructor, Dept. of English Translation, Islamic Azad University, Islamshahr, Iran.
1999-2003	Lecturer, Dept. of English Translation, Payame Noor University, Tehran, Iran.
1999-2002	Lecturer, Dept. of Nutrition Sciences, Shahid Beheshti Medical University, Tehran, Iran.

1998-2007 Teacher, Farhang High School, Tehran, Iran..

1993-1998 Teacher, Imam Ali Guidance School, Boroujerd, Iran.

RESEARCH

M.A. Thesis

"The Problem of Existence in Beckett's *Waiting For Godot* and *Endgame*."
M.A. Thesis, IAU, Tehran, March, 1999.

PUBLICATION

Sadrian, Mohammad Reza, ed. Improving Listening Skills. Tehran: Ball, 2008.

APPENDIX I

TURKISH SUMMARY

Stoppard'ın *Rosencrantz and Guildestern are Dead*, *The Real Inspector Hound* ve *Dogg's Hamlet, Cahoot's Macbeth*'te temel strateji olarak yaygın parodi kullanımını daha iyi inceleyebilmek adına, bu çalışma, parodi tanımının belirlenmesi ile başlıyor. Bu araştırmanın diğer bölümleri, öne sürülen tanımını baz alarak, parodinin, Stoppard'ın adı geçen oyunlarındaki uygulamalarını bulmaya ve analiz etmeye ayrılmıştır.

Parodinin tanımı, 20inci yüzyıl öncesi İngiliz literatüründeki gelişimi esnasında, parodinin incelendiği farklı perspektifleri gösteren çeşitli tanım önerilerinin bulunması açısından tartışmaya açık görünüyor. Söz konusu çeşitlilik ve herkesce kabul edilen bir tanımın eksikliği. 20. yüzyıl literatürü ve kritik gözlemlerinde de devam etmektedir. 20. yüzyılda insan çabalarının çeşitli alanlarındaki hızlı büyümesi ile birlikte parodi için ileri sürülen tanımlamalar da hızlı büyüme gösterdi. 20.yüzyılda geliştirilen çeşitli edebi teoriler tarafından sağlanan teorik zemin baz alınarak parodinin tanımlanması, parodiye bakılabilecek çeşitli perspektifler bulunması açısından daha da zor görünüyor.

Bu çalışma, parodinin antik edebiyattaki orijinal tanımına.ve 20. yüzyıl öncesi İngiliz edebiyatındaki tanımına kısaca bir göz atıyor ve daha sonra. 20. yüzyılın önemli edebi yaklaşımlarından dördünün ışığında parodinin tanımı üzerine odaklanıyor. Bu yaklaşımlar Genette'nin yapısalcı bakışı, Barthe'nin postyapısalcı bakış açısı, Derrida'nın deconstructionalist yaklaşımı ve Bakhtin'in diyalojik eleştirisidir.

Bu çalışmada "parodi" teriminin tanımı büyük ölçüde geliştirilmiş bir Bakhtinci bakış açısına dayanmaktadır. Bu tanımın, parodinin uzun vadeli geçmişi süresince yer alan bütün uygulama çeşitlerini içerecek kadar kapsamlı olma iddiasının bulunmadığını belirtmek gerekir. Daha çok Stoppard'ın adı

geçen oyunlarının derinlemesine incelenmesine uyan bir tanımdır. Böylece parodi, "sosyo – kültürel bir ürünün, orijinal imitasyon öznesine karşı bir tavır alan kasıtlı imitasyonu veya transformasyonu" olarak tanımlanabilir. Bu tavır, ne olursa olsun, en azından şakacılık içerir. Diğer bir deyişle, parodinin öznesine karşı tutumu değerlendirici olan veya olmayan, ironik veya hicivli, alaycı veya hayranlık içerir, vs olabilir, ancak en azından şakacı olmak durumundadır.

Parodinin önerilen tanımı, parodinin yaratılmasında yazarın amacını vurguluyor. Barthesçi perspektife göre parodinin ileri sürülen tanımında "kasıtlı" sıfatının varlığı kabul edilemezken, yazarın amacı, Bakhtin'de göz önüne alınıyor. Parodinin önerilen tanımında yazarın amacının dikkate alınması, alt metinleri olarak diğer metin, söylev veya sosyal ürünleri istemeden kullanan metinlerin parodi olarak kabul edilmemesine yol açıyor; yazar ya bu tip alt metinlerin varlığından haberdar değildir ya da onları taklit etmeyi amaçlamamıştır. Diğer bir deyişle, söz konusu metinin alt metnine karşı tavrı gerçek olmayacaktır, çünkü o metnin yazarı böyle bir alt metnin varlığını bilmiyordur.

Bu çalışmanın ileri sürdüğü tanıma göre bir parodi, alt metnini taklit edebilir ya da dönüştürebilir. Genette'nin kendi parodi tanımından taklidi çıkarıyor olmasına rağmen, bu çalışmada öne sürülen tanım, taklidi, parodi alt metninin parodinin içinde kullanılabileceği yollardan biri olarak kabul ediyor. Parodinin tanımı açısından yalnızca dönüştürme kabul edilirse, parodi başlıklar ve kısa metinlerle sınırlandırılmış olacaktır.

Bakhtin'in öncülüğünde, bu çalışma, parodinin alt metni olarak bir dizi alt metni dikkate alıyor. Parodinin alt metni, belirli bir metnin veya yazarın usulü, konusu, tonu, stili, diksiyonu, tutumu veya fikri olabilir; edebi bir tür ya da edebi olan veya olmayan yazımla ilgili herhangi bir tarz olabilir; parodi alt metni, ayrıca, herhangi bir tür sosyo – kültürel ürün içerebilir. Barthes ve Derrida'nın bakış açısından, herhangi bir metin, belirli bir yazarın stili ve bir tür (genre), göründükleri kadar saf olmamaları – yani kendi kendine yetebilir bir mevcudiyetleri ve ilişkili bir metnin olmaması – nedeniyle parodi alt metinleri

olarak kabul edilemezler. Ancak Barthes ve Derrida'nın postyapısal düşüncelerini kabul ederek, bu çalışma, bahsi geçen parodi alt metinlerini diğer ilgili birimlerden – metinler, yazarlar, türler, dil – ayrı değil, Stoppard'ın oyunlarında parodiyi inceleyebilmek adına faydalı kelimeler olduğunu ileri sürüyor.

Parodinin önerilen tanımında, parodinin alt metnine karşı tavrı şakacılık içeriyor. Bu fikir esasen Genette'nin parodi tanımından alınmış, ancak, bu çalışmadaki "şakacılık" sözü, Genette'nin atfettiği bazı imalara sahip değildir. Bu çalışmada uygulandığı şekliyle parodinin şakacı tavrı, örneğin parodinin alt metnine karşı değerlendirici olan veya olmayan, ironik veya hicivli ve alaycı veya hayranlık içerir tavrı gibi diğer bir takım tutumlarla birlikte alınabilir. Parodinin alt metnine karşı tavırlarının çoğulluğu şakacılığı hariç tutmaz, aksi takdirde, metnin anametinselliği kinaye, hiciv, taklit, öykünme, intihal, vs. olarak yorumlanabilir.

Parodi, çeşitli alt metinleri baz alınarak farklı türlere ayrılabilir. Bakhtin, alt metnine dayanarak bazı parodi çeşitlerini tür parodisi, satir oyun, parodia sacra, vs olarak adlandırıyor. Parodi çeşitlerinin, bazı alt metin kategorilerine göre sınıflandırılmaması durumunda, sayısız parodi çeşidi bulunması olasılığı ortaya çıkacaktır, çünkü parodi için sayısız alt metin mevcuttur. Farklı parodi alt metinleri açısından bazı kategorilerin varsayılması ve bunu baz alarak parodiyi bazı kategorilere ayırmak daha uygundur. Simon Dentith, *Parody*'sinde parodiyi iki gruba ayırır. Biri özgül diğeri genel parodidir. Özgül parodi, "belirli bir sanatsal çalışma veya yazın parçasının parodisinden oluşurken ... genel parodi, alt metnini yalnızca belirli bir çalışma olarak değil, bütün usülü, stili veya söylevi olarak alır" (Dentith 193-194). Parodiyi daha uygulanabilir türlere bölebilmek için, bu çalışma, Bakhtin'in genel görüşlerini ve Dentith'in bakış açısını genişletiyor. Böylece parodinin üç türü bulunduğu varsayılabilir. Bunlardan biri, belirli bir metin veya yazarın usulünü, tonunu, stilini, diksiyonunu, tutumunu veya fikrini alt metin olarak alan özgül parodidir. Diğeri, alt metin olarak bir tür veya türsel stili alan tür parodisidir. Bu edebi olan ya da olmayan bir tür olabilir. Sonuncusu, ancak en

önemsiz olmayanı, ise söylev parodisidir. Söylev parodisi, sözlü biçimden sözsüz biçime kadar herhangi bir insan etkinliğini alt metni olarak alabilir. Aynı zamanda, bu geniş grup, özgül ve tür parodileri hariç bütün parodi çeşitlerini içerir.

Bu farklı parodi türlerinin çeşitli fonksiyonları olduğu varsayılabilir, bazı eleştirmenlerin parodinin fonksiyonlarını bir veya birkaç taneyle sınırlamaya çalışmış olmalarına rağmen, parodinin postmodern kullanımı bir takım fonksiyonlar göstermektedir. Sonuç olarak bazı parodiler kendi orijinal öznelerine saldırmak üzere yıkıcı bir araç işlevi görürken, bazı diğer parodiler kendi orijinal öznelerine karşı takdir edici bir tavır gösterir; bazı parodiler, parodinin orijinal öznesiyle ilgili olarak yazarının güvensizliğini gösterirken, diğerleri orijinal öznelerinin eleştirel değerlendirmesini gösterir; diğerlerinin orijinal öznelerine karşı hiçbir değerlendirici tavır almadığı gerçeğine rağmen, bazı parodiler satirik amaçlarla kullanılırlar. Parodinin asıl uygulamalarına gelince, bu fonksiyonların bir kısmının kabul edilmesinin daha işlevsel olduğu görünüyor. Parodinin fonksiyonu ne olursa olsun, alt metnin yeniden yaratılmasına yol açar, çünkü ona karşı şakacı bir tavır alır ve onu değiştirir/yabancılaştırır.

Rosencrantz and Guildestern Are Dead, The Real Inspector Hound ve *Dogg's Hamlet, Cahoot's Macbeth*'inde Stoppard, parodiyi ağırlıklı ve temel strateji olarak uyguluyor. Bu oyunların her biri, farklı parodi türlerinin bir çok farklı çeşidini sergiliyor. Bu oyunlardaki yalnızca en önemli parodilerin hızlı bir değerlendirmesi, bunların çeşitli parodi türlerine ne kadar bağlı olduğunu gösteriyor. Bu parodiler, çalışılan oyunlarda farklı olarak işlev gösteriyorlar, ancak hepsinde ortak olarak bulunabilecek bir fonksiyon mevcuttur: alt metinlerinin yeniden yapılandırılması.

Rosencrantz and Guildestern Are Dead'inde Stoppard, muhtelif parodiler sergiliyor. Bu çeşitli parodiler kabaca üç kategori altında gruplandırılabilir: "Shakespeare'in *Hamlet* parodisi", "Beckett'in *Waiting for Godot* parodisi" ve daha az genişletilmiş diğer parodilerini içeren "müteferrik parodiler". Bu oyundaki en açık ve en önemli parodi, Shakespeare'in *Hamlet*'i

olan 'özgül parodi'dir. Genelde, Stoppard'ın *Rosencrantz and Guildestern Are Dead*'deki *Hamlet* parodisi üç büyük grup altında incelenebilir: karakterler, kurgu ve temalar. Stoppard'ın *Hamlet*'in karakterleri parodisi, Rosencrantz ve Guildestern'in parodik dramatizasyonuyla sınırlı değildir. Hamlet kadar Claudius ve Gertrude'u da parodileştiriyor. Hatta bazen Stoppard'ın oyununun karakterleri, kendi orijinal mukabil karakterlerinden çok *Hamlet*'in diğer bazı karakterlerini parodileştiriyor.

Stoppard'ın karakterler açısından Rosencrantz and Guildenstern parodisi, *Hamlet*'teki orijinal konuşmaların Stoppard'ın oyununda dramatik olaylara dönüştürülmesinden ve konuşmaların farklı anlamlarla kullanılmasından anlaşılabilir. Rosencrantz ve Guildestern'in *Hamlet*'teki tanımlamaları ve *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern Are Dead*'deki tanımlamaları arasında, sonuç itibariyle Stoppard'ın oyunundaki şakacı dramatizasyonun oluşturulmasına yardımcı olan diğer bir dizi farklılıklar bulunmaktadır. Bunlar aslında Stoppard'ın oyununda iki büyük karaktere dönüştürülen Shakespeare'in dramasında iki küçük karakterdir. *Hamlet*'in tüm muğlak dünyası, bu küçük karakterlerin kısıtlı bakış açısından görülüyor. Sonuç, *Hamlet*'in genel olarak eğlenceli bir portresi ve saray mensuplarının eğlenceli bir taslağı oluyor. Stoppard, ayrıca, iki saray mensubunun bazı orijinal konuşmalarını, sahne üstü aksiyonlara dönüştürüyor: örneğin, Elsinore'a yolculukları ve Danimarka'daki kaleye gidiş yolunda oyuncuları işaret etmeleri. Bazen onlara orijinal trajedide bulunmayan bazı aksiyonlar ve konuşmalar veriyor, örneğin İngiltere'ye giden gemideki maceraları ve orada oyuncu grubuyla tanışmaları. Stoppard bazen kendi Rosencrantz ve Guildenstern'ine Shakespeare'in *Hamlet*'inde verilen diyaloglarla aynı diyalogları veriyor, ancak bu diyaloglardan farklı anlamlar ve etkiler oluşturuyor. Stoppard, genel olarak *Hamlet*'in diyaloglarını yeniden yerleştirerek bu diyaloglara kendi şakacı tavrını ekliyor. Bu diyalogların Shakespeare'in şiirsel dili ile gülünç oyundaki 20. yüzyıl ortalarının düzyazı içeriği arasındaki uyuşmazlık, okuyucu/izleyici üzerinde komik olmasa da şakacı bir etki uyandırmalarını sağlıyor. Bu değişiklikleri yaparak Stoppard'ın

oyunu, Rosencrantz ve Guildestern'i mizahi bir şekilde resimliyor ve böylece onları parodileştiriyor.

Stoppard'ın Hamlet resmi, ayrıca, Shakespeare'in trajedisinde karşılığı olan karakterin parodik dramatizasyonudur. Stoppard, Rosencrantz ve Guildestern'in resmedilişinde uygulanan stratejilerin hemen hemen aynılarını kullanarak, onları iki saray mensubunun kısıtlı bakış açısından sunma yoluyla Hamlet'in orijinal konuşma ve aksiyonlarını yeniden yerleştiriyor. Buna ek olarak, oyunda, İngiltere'ye yolculuğu gibi Hamlet'in orijinal konuşmalarının sahne üstü aksiyonlarına dönüştürüldüğü zamanlar da var. Orijinal karakterdeki bütün değişikliklerin doğul sonucu, Shakespeare'in dramasının trajik kahramanı Hamlet'in sınırlı bir mizahi sunumudur.

Claudius ve Gertrude da kendi orijinal karakterlerinin parodileridir. Genellikle orijinal konuşmaları Shakespearevarici şiirlerle yaparak dramatize ediliyorlar; ancak, orijinal trajedideki gibi tam olarak sunulmadıkları ve şiirsel konuşmaları içerikle keskin bir zıtlık arz ettikleri için, Rosencrantz and Guildestern tarafından sunulan 20. yüzyıl nesri bağlamında komik karakterler oluyorlar. Oyunun, orijinal karakterizasyonlarına, iki saray mensubunun – Rosencrantz ve Guildestern – isimleri üzerine yaptıkları hatalar gibi bazı diğer farklılıkları getirmesiyle dramatizasyonlarındaki komiklik artıyor. Bu nedenle onlar, Stoppard'ın oyunundaki diğer parodik karakterlerdir.

Rosencrantz and Guildenstern Are Dead'in kurgusu genel itibariyle dört kategoriye bölünebilir. İlk kategori Shakespear'in *Hamlet*'i ile örtüşen kısımları kapsıyor. İkincisi, *Hamlet*'in kurgusuna teğet geçtiği zaman ve üçüncüsü *Hamlet*'in karakterlerinin sağladığı bilgi baz alındığında ortaya çıkıyor. *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern Are Dead*'in kurgusunun sonuncu olan, ancak en önemsiz olmayan, bölümü Stoppard'ın gerçekten yarattığı kısımları ihtiva ediyor. Stoppard'ın oyun kurgusunun ilk üç bölümü, yalnızca *Hamlet*'in kurgusunun bazı kısımlarını değiştirerek takrar etmekle kalmıyor, ayrıca onları şakacı bir şekilde tasarlıyor – yani *Hamlet*'in kurgusunu parodileştiriyorlar.

Rosencrantz and Guildenstern Are Dead'inde Stoppard, *Hamlet*'in bazı temalarını yineliyor; ancak, bazılarına şakacılıkla yaklaşıyor. *Hamlet*'in

Rosencrantz and Guildenstern Are Dead'inde Stoppard tarafından şakacılıkla yaklaşılan temaları 'kader ve yazgı' ve 'ölüm, ölümün gizemli doğası ve sonrasında ne olacağının belirsizliğidir'.

Oyundaki diğer büyük parodi, Beckett'in *Waiting for Godot*'sunu alt metin olarak alıyor. Bu özgül parodi, Stoppard'ın Beckett'in stilini ve Beckett'in bazı karakterlerinin diyalogları kadar, karakteristik özelliklerini de şakacı bir şekilde uygulaması yoluyla kendini gösteriyor. Stoppard bazen Beckett'in oyununu sözlü seviyede parodileştiriyor. Bu sözlü parodiler Rosencrantz ve Guildestern'in bazı diyaloglarında olduğu kadar, onların sözlü oyunlarında da bulunabilir. Beckett'in *Waiting for Godot*'sunun *Rosencrantz and Guildestern are Dead*'de parodileştirilen bir diğer sözlü tekniği ise stichomythia. Buna ek olarak Stoppard'ın oyununda dramatize edilen komik aksiyonlar bazen Beckett'in hüzünlü oyunundaki aksiyonları parodileştiriyor. Rosencrantz ve Guildestern, Vladimir ve Estergon'un kafa karışıklığı ve hafıza yanılgıları gibi bazı karakteristik özelliklerini gösteriyorlar; ancak, Rosencrantz ve Guildestern'deki bu özelliklerin karakterizasyonu, düştükleri absürd durumdan çok komik durumu ön plana çıkarmak üzere sanatsal olarak yapılandırılıyorlar.

Stoppard'ın *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern Are Dead*'i, şimdiye kadar adı geçmiş olan parodilere benzemeyen diğer bazı parodiler sergiliyor. Bu parodiler, daha önce adı geçenlere kıyasla daha küçük kısımlarda görülüyor. Bu parodilerin çoğunluğu söylev parodisi altında kategorize edilebilir, çünkü – İncil'in bir satırının ve Osborne'un *The Entertainer*'ının bir satırının parodileri haricinde – belirli bir metnin veya türün parodileri değillerdir. Bu parodiler**,** olasılık kuralı parodilerini, akademik dil parodisini ve bir oyunun dikkatli seyircilerinin parodisini içerir. İncil'in bir satırının ve Osborne'un *The Entertainer*'ının bir satırının parodisi özgül parodilerdir.

Rosencrantz and Guildenstern Are Dead'de uygulanan parodilerin fonksiyonları değişiyor. "Stoppard *Hamlet'in* doğrudan değerlendirmesini hiçbir yerde yapmıyor" (Hunter 1982:133) olmasına rağmen, oyun genel olarak Shakespeare'in *Hamlet*'ine karşı olumlu bir tavır sergiliyor. *Hamlet* parodisi, alt

metnine ilişkin hicivli imalar da içeriyor, ancak bunlar daha çok şefkatli hicivlerdir. Stoppard'ın bu parodideki hiciv eğilimi şu noktaları vurgulama amacı güdüyor:"Rosencrantz ve Guildestern'in, dramatist kadar Claudius tarafından da küstahça *kullanılmış* olması[...] Hamlet'in kederli iç gözlemi ve Shakespeare'in korsan saldırısında açıkca yaptığı kurgu aylaklığı" (Hunter 1982; 137-8) Beckett'in *Waiting for Godot*'sunun parodisi, Stoppard'ın alt metnini yeniden yaratışını şakacılıkla gösterir ve tavır açısından takdir edicidir. *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern Are Dead*'deki olasılık kuralı, akademik dil ve bir oyunun dikkatli izleyenlerinin söylev parodileri, temelde Stoppard'ın onlarla alay edişini ortaya koyar. Bu parodiler, Stoppard'ın onlarla ilgili kötümser bakışına işaret ediyor. Ancak İncil'in bir satırının ve Osborne'un *The Entertainer*'ının bir satırının şakacı parodisi alaycı görünmüyor. Daha çok kendi elt metinlerini doğrudan ya da dolaylı olarak herhangi bir yargılama yapmaksızın yeniden yapılandırıyorlar.

The Real Inspector Hound da temelde parodiden beslenen bir oyun. Ana çerçeveyi oluşturan bir kurgusu ve bir de iç kurgusu bulunuyor. Ana oyun kendi seyircisinin parodisiyle – söylev parodisi – başlıyor. Orijinal öznesi olarak drama eleştirmenlerini kendi jargonlarıyla alan diğer bir söylev parodisi ile devam ediyor. Oyun içindeki oyun, ilk ve öncelikli olarak, Stoppard'ın komedisini yazdığı dönemde –ve hatta şimdi bile- moda ve zirvede olan polisiye türünü parodileştiriyor. Bu tür parodisi, basmakalıp kurgudan, karakterlerden ve iç oyunun hem ana çerçeveden ayrıldığı hem de örtüştükleri zamanlardaki bazı diğer sıradan kurallardan anlaşılabilir. İç oyunun diğer önemli parodisi, Agatha Christie'nin ünlü romanı *The Mousetrap'dir*. İç oyun, böylelikle, hem bir tür parodisi hem de özgül parodiyi aynı anda sergiliyor.

The Real Inspector Hound, seyircinin görüntüsünü kendisine yansıtan büyük bir ayna kullanarak kendi seyircisinin parodisi ile başlıyor. Birdboot ve Moon, başlangıçta seyirci olarak dramatize ediliyorlar. Bu parodi, ayrıca, iki karakterin kişisel isteklerinin oyunda komik olarak dramatize edilmeleri ile ön plana çıkıyor. Ancak oyunun performansı devam ettikçe Moon ve Birdboot'un

izledikleri oyunun açılış performansını değerlendirmek üzere gönderilmiş iki eleştirmen oldukları ortaya çıkıyor.

Moon ve Birdboot'un eleştirmenler olarak parodik sunumu hem özel hem de toplumda kullandıkları seslerinden de anlaşılabilir[1]. Çikolata yiyen şehvet düşkünü Birdboot, "herşeyi dış görünüşüne göre değerlendiren" (Sammells 56) flörtçü bir yıldız avcısı olarak portre ediliyor. Öte yandan hırslı olan Moon "sonsuzluğu bir kum zerresinde ve kozmik önemi üçüncü seviyede" (Billington 65) bulma eğilimi gösteren dalgın bir eleştirmen olarak resmediliyor. Birdboot'un eleştirisi, sıradan seyirciyi hedef alan "sansasyonel sağduyu" iken, Moon'unki seçkin okuyuculara yöneltilen "kalburüstü entellektüalizm"dir (Sammells 56). Bu kiritik gözlemlerin her biri komik bir şekilde birkaç kritik stil arz ediyor.

Eleştirmenlerin parodisi, eleştirmenler oyuna dahil olduklarında iki farklı ses karışırken de devam ediyor. Özel seslerinde Moon ve Birboot komik bir şekilde kendi narsist dileklerini ve hayallerini gösteriyorlar. Toplumda kullandıkları seslerinde, eleştirmenlerin dilini ve jargonunu çeşitli komik tanımlamalarla birlikte parodileştiriyorlar. Dileklerini gerçekleştirmeleri de eleştirmenlerle alay etmek için komik bir şekilde dramatize ediliyor.

Eleştirmenlerin parodisinin bir uzantısı olarak iki aktör – Simon ve Dedektif Hound – eleştirmenlerin yerini alıyor. Yeni kimlikleri ile önceki eleştirmenlerin dilleri ve jestlerini parodileştiriyorlar. Bu parodi, sergilenen oyunun bir kısmını parodileştirmesi açısından Stoppard'ın kendi parodisidir. Aynı zamanda eleştirmenlerin ve jargonlarının da parodisidir.

Cinayet kurgusu genel okuyucuların en gözde türlerinden biri olmasına rağmen, konvansiyonlarının çoğu eskimiştir. Stoppard'ın *The Real Inspector Hound*'da temel olarak ilgilendiği diğer bir konu da bu popüler türü parodileştirmektir. Bu parodi, komik oyunda – sonunda ana oyun olan eleştirmenlerinki ile birleşen oyun içindeki oyunda – sunuluyor. Yazay oyunda cinayet kurgularının basmakalıp kurallarının neredeyse tamamını uyguluyor ve aynı zamanda onlarla alay ediyor. Türü parodileştirmesi, suç kurgusunun kalıplaşmış kurgusunu, karakterlerini, dekorlarını ve ağırlıklı olarak belirsizlik,

gizem, olanaksızlık, şans, tesadüf, hile, kulak misafiri olma ve radyo polis mesajlarına dayanma gibi diğer yan öğeleri komik bir şekilde taklit etmesinden anlaşılabilir. Ana çerçeve kurgusu iç oyun kurgusuyla örtüşmeden önce suç kurgularının teşhir olunması, oyunun başlangıcı gibi parodileştiriliyor. Ana çerçeve kurgusu polisiye kurguyla birleşip, sonra gerçek polis ajanının ortaya çıkmasına yol açarken, polisiye türünün yan karmaşıklıkları ve neticelendirilmesi ile alay ediliyor. Stoppard'ın komedisinde türün alay edilen temel karakterleri: 'maktul' – yani 'suç' – 'dedektif' ve 'yabancı' ya da 'davetsiz misafir'dir. Hizmetçi ve 'şen dul ev sahibiesi' ile köy evinin 'misafirleri' de dahil olmak üzere diğer karakterler de komik bir şekilde sunuluyor; ancak, bunlar daha çok köy evi suç kurgularında tipik karakterlerdir.

Stoppard, *The Real Inspector Hound*'unda çok katmanlı bir parodi yaratıyor. Oyunun ana odağı eleştirmenleri ve cinayet türünü parodileştirmek olmasına rağmen, bazı belirli metinlerle de alay etmekten geri kalmıyor. Christie'nin *The Mousetrap*'i, Stoppard'ın oyunundaki gösteride tekrar tekrar ana orijinal özne olarak gösteriliyor; ancak içerisindeki özgül parodinin orijinal öznesi olarak bir dizi belirli çalışma ileri sürüyor. Christie'nin *The Mousetrap*'inin parodisi, kurguda, geleneksel karakterlerde ve Stoppard'ın oyununda uyguladığı diğer yan öğelerde – örneğin yer ve zaman, polis mesajları ve telefon kesintisi – gözlenebilir.

The Real Inspector Hound farklı tavır ve fonksiyonlara sahip parodileri uyguluyor. Örneğin, bu oyunda seyircinin parodisi, değerlendirici bir fonksiyonunun da olmasına rağmen, çoğunlukla orijinal öznesine karşı şakacı bir tavır sergiliyor. Stoppard'ın da teyit ettiği üzere, bu parodi seyircinin dileklerini ve gerçekleşmelerinin tehlikelerini gösteriyor (Ambushes 8). Öte yandan eleştirmenlerin jargonları ile parodisi öncelikli olarak kendi orijinal öznesine saldırmak için yıkıcı bir araç olarak kullanılıyor. Stoppard'ın eleştirmenlerle ilgili – aksiyon adamı olmaktan çok düşünür olduklarına yönelik (Times 1219)– olumsuz fikri kendini bu parodide ortaya koyuyor. Cinayet türünün parodisi alt metnine karşı değerlendirmeci bir tavır alıyor. Stoppard'ın oyunu, kalıplaşmış kurguyla, yan karakterlerle ve türün diğer bazı klişe

konvansiyonlarıyla alay ederek, ikna edici ve makul olmadıklarınının altını çiziyor. Oyundaki diğer büyük parodinin alt metnine karşı da hemen hemen aynı tavır alınıyor. Christie'nin *The Mousetrap*'inin parodisi,orijinal öznesinin kurgusu, karakterleri ve dekoru da dahil olmak üzere tahmin edilebilir ve ikna edici olmayan doğasını vurguluyor.

Stoppard'ın *Dogg's Hamlet*, *Cahoot's Macbeth*'teki parodisel stratejisi, *Rosencrantz and Guildestern are Dead*'deki parodi uygulamasından sönük bir şekilde kendisini gösteriyor. Ancak bu durum *Dogg's Hamlet*, *Cahoot's Macbeth*'te parodinin bol olmadığı anlamına gelmiyor. Oyunun ilk bölümünde – *Dogg's Hamlet* – Stoppard, alt metinleri temel olarak Wittgenstein'ın dil oyunu, İngiliz dili ve Shakespeare'in *Hamlet*'i olan bazı farklı parodileri kullanıyor. Ayrıca, oyunun diğer parodileri gibi oyunun parodisel dili – Dogg dili – ile alakalı olan bazı küçük parodiler de bulunuyor. Bu parodilerin hepsi Shakespeare'in okul performanslarının parodisinin ana çerçevesi dahilinde bulunuyor. Shakespeare'in okul performanslarının parodisi, genel anlamda amatör performansların parodisini kapsayacak şekilde genişletilebilen bir söylev parodisidir. Wittgenstein'ın dil oyunu ve İngiliz dili parodileri, oyunun ilk bölümünde geliştirilen ve ikinci bölümünde – *Cahoot's Macbeth* – genişletilen parodiler; ancak oyunun ikinci bölümünde vurgu daha çok İngiliz dili parodisine düşüyor. Stoppard'ın oyunun ilk bölümündeki *Hamlet* özgül parodisi, *Hamlet*'in kurgusuna ve karakterlerine, Shakespeare'in bu ünlü trajedisinin okul performansı biçimine komik yaklaşımından farkedilebilir. Oyunun birinci bölümündeki diğer küçük parodiler, orijinal özneleri 'My Way' şarkısı, İngilizce konuşan spor-spikerleri ve zafer işareti olarak parmaklarla yapılan 'V' işareti olan söylev parodileridir.

Oyunun ikinci bölümü *Cahoot's Macbeth*, totaliter rejimlerin tehdidi altında oturma odası performanslarının söylev parodisini gösteriyor. Bu parodi boyunca, Stoppard bir özgül parodi – özellikle de Shakespeare'in trajedisi Doggca oynandığında açıkca görülen Shakespeare'in *Macbeth*'inin parodisi – sergiliyor. Stoppard'ın *Macbeth* parodisi Shakespeare'in trajedisi ile alay edilmesini içermiyor. Ünlü trajediyi, daha çok şakacı bir şekilde sunuyor. Bu

iki ana parodinin çerçevesi dahilinde *Cahoot's Macbeth*, diğer bazı parodileri de sergiliyor. İngiliz dili kadar Müfettiş karakterinde totaliter ülkelerdeki baskı unsurlarını da parodileştiriyor. Bu parodiler söylev parodilerdir. Dogg dili şeklindeki İngiliz dili parodisi, ikili oyunun ilk bölümünden alınıyor ve burada parodileştirilen Wittgenstein'ın teorilerine dayanıyor; böylece Wittgenstein'ın dil oyununu daha az vurgulayarak parodileştiriyor.

Dogg's Hamlet, *Cahoot's Macbeth*'teki parodiler, kendi alt metinlerine karşı çeşitli tavırlar resmediyor. Oyunun ilk bölümünde Stoppard'ın Wittgenstein'ın dil oyunu parodisi değerlendirmeci görünerek, Stoppard'ın, Wittgenstein'ın önerisine olan hayranlığını betimliyor. Ancak İngiliz dili parodisi hayranlık içermiyor. Daha çok parodinin kendi alt metnine karşı şakacı tavrını, kusurunu – bir kelime ya da ibarenin farklı muhataplar tarafından tamamen farklı düşünceler anlatmak üzere kullanılabilerek yanlış anlaşılmalara ve iletişim bozukluğuna yol açabilmesi – komik bir şekilde dramatize ederek gösteriyor. Oyunun ilk bölümündeki prodisel okul performansı orijinal öznesine karşı eleştirel bir tavır takınıyor. Shakespeare'in Elizabeth dönemine ait dilinin anlaşılmasının zorluğunun altını çizerek, Batı okullarındaki zorunlu Shakespeare derslerini ve performaslarını eleştiriyor. Shakespeare'in *Hamlet*'inin , 'My Way' şarkısının, İngilizce konuşan spor-spikerlerinin ve 'V' işaretinin parodileri, orijinal öznelerine karşı takdirkar bir tavır sergiliyora benzemiyor. Öncelikli olarak kendi alt metinlerini şakacı bir şekilde yeniden yapılandırıyorlar.

Oyunun ilk bölümü temel olarak komik parodileri(What do you mean by "comic parodies"?) dramatize ederken, ikinci bölümündeki parodiler genel itibariyle hicivli. Diğer bir deyişler Stoppard, ikinci bölümdeki parodilerinin çoğunda komik ve ciddi niyetlerin karışımını sunuyor. Oyunun ikinci bölümünde, *Cahoot's Macbeth*, ağırlıklı olarak 1970'lerÇekoslovakya'sında komünist rejiminin tehdidi altında Shakespeare'in *Macbeth*'inin oda performansını parodiileştiriyor. Orijinal öznesine karşı ciddi bir eleştirel tavır takınan bu parodi, komünist rejimi sırasında Çekoslovakya'da yasaklanan aktörlerin durumunu eleştiriyor ve aktörlerin ve tiyatroların baskı altına

alınmasını hicvediyor. Geniş bir perspektiften bakıldığında bu parodi, bütün totaliter rejimlerde aktörlerin ve tiyatroların baskılanmasının protestosunu kapsayacak şekilde genişletilebilir. Bu konuyla ilgili olarak komünist Çekoslovakya'daki baskı unsuru olarak Müfettiş'in parodisi görülebilir. Böyle bir unsurun hicvedilmesi nedeniyle bu parodi totaliter ülkelerdeki insanlara ve aktörlere karşı tehditkar ve hakaret dolu hareketleri ile bütün baskı unsurlarına bir saldırı olarak düşünülebilir. Bu parodilerden farklı olarak *Macbeth* parodisi, Elizabeth dönemi trajedisinin evrensel ve modern zaman uygulamalarını vurgulayarak, Shakespeare'in ünlü politik trajedisine karşı sıklıkla şakacı bir şekilde takdirkar bir tavır sergiliyor.

Nitekim, Stoppard'ın adı geçen oyunlarında çeşitli tavırlar ve bu nedenle bu parodilere atfedilebilecek çeşitli fonksiyonlar bulunuyor; bununla beraber, bu çeşitli fonksiyonlar arasında en az bir ortak nokta bulunmaktadır. Stoppard'ın parodileri – ve genel olarak parodiler – alt metinlerine karşı en azından şakacı bir tavır yönelttikleri için, alt metinlerini tahrip ediyorlar; ancak bu tahribat, yıkıma uğrayan alt metnin yeniden yapılandırılmasına yol açıyor. Stoppard'ın adı geçen oyunlarındaki alt metin tahribatları, yeniden düzenlenmelerinin yanısıra, orijinal öznelerinin yeni anlamlar ve parodi bağlamında yeni imalar taşımalarını sağlıyor. Bu durum Stoppard'ın Shakespeare'in oyunlarını tekrar tekrar parodileştirmesinde daha canlı bir şekilde görülebilir. Parodilerinin – özellikle de Shakespeare parodilerinin – içinde saklı olan anlam, sonuç itibariyle Stoppard'ın Oyuncu'sunun ifadesinde yankılandığı gibi postyapısalcı düşüncesine işaret ediyor: "Belirsizlik normal haldir" (RAGAD 66). Stoppard'ın ima ettiği belirsizlik, daha geniş bağlamda, postyapısalcı fikirlerde de yansıtılan kaygan ve istikrarsız zemin nedeniyle ortaya çıkan anlamı belirsizliğidir (Levenson 156, 162). Bu tavır, açık bir şekilde diğer parodilerinde de dramatize ediliyor, özellikle de *Dogg's Hamlet, Cahoot's Macbeth*'teki Wittgenstein'ın dil oyunu ve İngiliz dilinde. Stoppard'ın kendi kelimeleri de oyun yazarının kafa yapısını gösteriyor. Bir durumun, Stoppard'ın oyunlarında dramatize ettiği gibi, her zaman için tepeden görünümü varsa, Stoppard'ın Shakespeare'i parodileştirme konusundaki ısrarı,

diğer şeylerle birlikte, çoğunlukla şaire yönelik "seyirciyi Shakespeare ikonunun anıtsallığını yeniden gözden geçirmeye" (Kelly 2002:18) teşvik eden saygın ve eleştirel tepeden bakışı olabilir.

Stoppard'ın *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern Are Dead*, *The Real Inspector Hound*, and *Dogg's Hamlet, Cahoot's Macbeth*'inin parodi açısından detaylı çalışmasının eksikliği olmasa da kıtlığı, bu çalışmanın gerçekleştirilme sebeplerinden biriydi. Bu çalışmada yapılan analize uygun olarak, Stoppard, adı geçen oyunlarını yaratırken baskın strateji olarak çeşitli parodilere dayanıyor. Bu oyunlarda ve daha sonraki oyunlarında da çeşitli alt metinleri yeniden yapılandırarak, Stoppard, parodiden baskın stratejisi olarak yaratıcı bir şekilde faydalanıyor, o kadar çok faydalanıyor ki eserleri haklı olarak "parodi tiyatrosu" şeklinde adlandırılabilir (Sammells 16).